DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 595 CG 014 756

AUTHOR Penn, Phillip D.
TITLE Project BORN FREE. Evaluation of the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping. Technical Report No. 10.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 78
GRANT 565AH70023
NOTE 197p.; For related documents see CG 014 752-757 and ED 150 493-495.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Careers; Educational Cooperation; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Leadership Training; *Material Development; Participant Satisfaction; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Resource Materials; *Sex Stereotypes; *Staff Development; Summer Programs; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Project BORN FREE

ABSTRACT

BORN FREE is a project designed as a collaborative effort of university-based counseling psychologists and field-site educators to reduce career-related sex stereotyping in 14 educational institutions. This report describes the evaluation of the five-day 1978 National Summer Institute, a staff development training workshop for educational leaders. The workshop was designed to provide participants with (1) a workshop training model; (2) training materials; and (3) attitudes, knowledge, and skills to reduce career-related sex stereotyping in their institutions. This report, concentrating on evaluation of the workshop training model by national participants, describes the characteristics of the workshop and participants, examines workshop strengths and weaknesses, and assesses workshop impact upon the participants. Chapters provide an introduction to the Project, a description of the evaluation design, description of institute characteristics, the evaluation methodology used, and an analysis of Pre- and Post-Institute assessment data. Appendices include pre- and post-assessment instruments, data tables, other materials related to the evaluation design, and a listing of Project publications. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193595

Project BORN FREE

CAREER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING MODELS TO

REDUCE SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPING IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

L. Sunny Hansen, Director

EVALUATION OF THE 1978 BORN FREE NATIONAL INSTITUTE: A WORKSHOP MODEL TO REDUCE CAREER-RELATED SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Phillip D. Penn, Evaluator

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tyra Sidberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Technical Report No. 10

Grant #565 AH 70023

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology
Department of Psychoeducational Studies
College of Education
University of Minnesota
139 Burton Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

October, 1978

CG 014756

OCT 6 1980

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED -- No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

Preface

Evaluation has been an important part of Project BORN FREE since its inception. An important part of that evaluation has been the attempt to assess the impact of the major institutes built into the BORN FREE proposal: the 1977 Local Summer Institute for educators from the 11 participating institutions, and the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute for educational leaders from around the nation. Besides training persons to bring about change in the area of sex equity in career options, the Institutes provided a vehicle for field testing Project materials which have been developed over the two years.

The Institute was planned and carried out by the BORN FREE staff, largely part-time graduate students in the Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology Program at the University of Minnesota. For whatever success the Institute may have had, they deserve much credit and thanks. This report provides an extensive analysis of the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute. It describes the characteristics of the selected participants, activities scheduled, the evaluation methodology used, and the analysis of results. It is presented in a way that we hope will be useful to those wishing to use BORN FREE materials to help reduce sex bias in career options.

As with other parts of the Project, the evaluation tasks have taken an enormous amount of time. A great deal of credit must go to Phillip Penn who accepted the eleventh hour assignment of writing this report--on a quarter-time appointment. Obviously, its completion has taken many donated hours beyond the end of the Project, and we are grateful for his willingness to follow the task

through. Dennis Keierleber, first-year evaluator, also deserves a word of acknowledgement, as his evaluation model for the 1977 Local Institute report served as an excellent model for this one.

We also wish to acknowledge the contribution to this report of Fred Krusemark, change process evaluator, who created the Pre-Assessment and Post-Assessment instruments and did a lot of initial conceptualizing of the Institute evaluation. He also worked steadily during the Institute on formative evaluation of workshop progress.

A special word of thanks is due Terry Roiger, who typed much of the report, and to Barbara Lutz and Elsie Mitchell, who provided last-minute typing assistance. Grateful appreciation is also expressed to secretary and graduate student Shelly Heck for her patience and painstaking help in bringing these reports to closure.

Finally, we are grateful to the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, without whose support this Project and this Institute would not have been possible, as well as to the College of Education.

We hope this analysis of the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute will contribute to our knowledge and understanding of more effective training models to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping--of both women and men--in educational institutions.

L. Sunny Hansen, Ph.D.
Professor and Director
Project BORN FREE
October 1978

CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface	
I.	Introduction	1
	Project Description	1
	Overview of Evaluation Design	4
	Purpose of This Report	7
II.	Institute Characteristics	9
	Objectives	9
	Participant Selection	9
	Institute Staff	12
	Institute Materials	12
	Institute Activities	14
	Retreat	14
	Presentations	14
	Developmental Growth Groups	15
	Learning Strategies or Activities	15
	Networking of Problems and Solutions	17
	Videotapes	17
	Implementation Groups	18
	Logs	18
	Readings	18
III.	Evaluation Methodology	20
	Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants	21
	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants	23
	Data Analysis	25
IV.	Results--Pre-Institute Assessment	27
	Pre-Institute Assessment	27
	Participant Characteristics	27
	Institutional and State Background Information	28
	Previous Activities and Experiences	34
V.	Results--Post-Institute Assessment	47
	Post-Institute Assessment	47
	Major Aspects of the Institute	52
	Retreat Evaluation	53
	Evaluation of Institute Itself	59
	Other Activities	64
	Ratings of Specific Activities Within the Institute	69
	Presentations	69
	Videotapes	70
	Developmental Growth Groups	71

Contents (continued)

Page

Implementation Planning and Presentation 72
Resource Panels and Groups 74
Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions 74
Post-Institute Correspondence 76

V. Conclusions and Recommendations 77

Conclusions 77
Institute Effectiveness 77
Workshop Activities 79
General 80
Recommendations 80
Participant Characteristics 81
Comparison with the 1977 Local Institute 82
Some Final Recommendations 83
Evaluation Needs 84
Summary 85

References 87

Appendices 88

Appendix A: Tables 1-A to 20-A

Appendix B: Retreat and Institute Schedules

Appendix C: Post-Institute Correspondence

Appendix D: D-1 Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants
D-2 Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants
D-3 Project BORN FREE Retreat Evaluation Form

Appendix E: Listing of BORN FREE Products and Publications

Appendix F: Components of Project BORN FREE Evaluation in Second Year

Appendix G: Project Abstract

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Project BORN FREE Retreat Evaluation Form	89
2.	Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Institutional Background Information	91
3.	Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Awareness	94
4.	Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Knowledge	95
5.	Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Skills	96
6.	Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Attitudes/Values	97
7.	BORN FREE National Institute: Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments--Present Awareness	98
8.	BORN FREE National Institute: Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments--Present Knowledge	100
9.	BORN FREE National Institute: Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments--Present Skills	101
10.	BORN FREE National Institute: Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments--Present Attitudes/Values	102
11.	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Awareness	103

TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
12.	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Knowledge	104
13.	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants Present Skills	105
14.	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Present Attitudes/Values	106
15.	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Ratings of Major Aspects of the Institute	107
16.	Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE National Institute Participants: Ratings of Specific Activities Within the Institute	109
17.	Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions: Section I: Institute's Impact on You	111
18.	Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions: Section II: Evaluation of the Institute	114
19.	Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions Section III: Conclusions and Recommendations	115
20.	Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions Section III: Conclusions and Recommendations	116

I. Introduction

BORN FREE is a training and development grant to broaden the range of career options for both women and men. Funded through the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, U. S. Office of Education, the program aims to create transportable career development training modules (training packets, workshop designs, nine color videotapes, and viewers' guides) for parents, teachers, counselors, and administrators at all educational levels, kindergarten through higher education. The shortened title of Project BORN FREE is an acronym that expresses exactly what the project is about: Build Options, Reassess Norms, Free Roles through Educational Equity.

The 14 schools and higher education institutions participating in the Project are Lincoln Elementary, Sunrise Junior High, and Mariner High School in White Bear Lake; Webster Elementary, Mounds Park Junior High, and Washington High School (replacing the St. Paul Open School which participated in the Project during the first year) in St. Paul; Harley Hopkins Elementary, North Junior High, and Eisenhower High School in Hopkins. The higher education institutions involved in BORN FREE are Lakewood Community College and 916 Vocational-Technical Institute in White Bear Lake; Normandale Community College in Bloomington; the CLA Career Planning Office (University of Minnesota); and Augsburg College in Minneapolis.

During the first year of Project operation, teams of teachers/professors and counselors/student personnel workers were named in each setting to identify needs and assess the career-related sex-role stereotyping in existence. Together with Project staff from the University, primarily graduate students in Counseling and

Student Personnel Psychology (CSPP), teams produced training materials to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions. These materials and one completed videotape, "A World of Options," were field-tested at a local BORN FREE Summer Institute in 1977 at the University of Minnesota. Forty counselors, teachers, and administrators from the 14 institutions participating in BORN FREE attended the two-week Institute.

In the second year of Project operation, the 40 participants from the local Summer Institute worked with the field site members from the first year to implement BORN FREE activities in their respective schools and colleges. These activities have included inservice workshops and field testing BORN FREE training materials.

The University of Minnesota staff served as consultants to the field site teams during BORN FREE'S second year. In addition, the staff revised the field-tested training materials and completed the remaining videotapes. The University staff has consisted of a Director, two Administrative Assistants, one General Project Assistant, three Project Assistants/Consultants, one Media Specialist, three Evaluators, a full-time Secretary and a part-time Clerk-typist. All of the staff except the Secretary had a part-time appointment.

A BORN FREE National Institute was held June, 1978, at the University of Minnesota. Over one hundred educators were selected to attend the Institute. According to the original plan for the Institute, each state was to be represented by one counselor and one instructor or administrator from various developmental levels, kindergarten through higher education. This plan was followed, for the most part, although the composition of the group varied somewhat

due to the variability in the quality and quantity of applications received from each state. The revised training materials and eight of the nine videotapes were field tested with this national group of educators. Upon their return home, the National Institute participants have begun to implement plans for integrating the BORN FREE goals and materials into their respective states and/or institutions. Each state implementation plan was a collaborative effort on the part of all participants from that respective state.

Overview of Project Evaluation in First and Second Year

Throughout the two years of Project BORN FREE, systematic evaluation has played a major role. The Project was evaluated both internally by a team of evaluators and also externally by a process evaluator contracted by the Women's Educational Equity Program to study BORN FREE as one of nine case study projects.

The BORN FREE overall evaluation design has been divided into three major components: (1) Product Evaluation; (2) Change Process Evaluation[1]; and (3) BORN FREE Training Institute Evaluation. Obviously, while these three aspects have been treated as independent and distinct, each with different evaluation goals and methodologies, there is considerable overlap among them, e.g., when field testing Project materials at local institutions and at the BORN FREE training institutes. These three evaluation components are described in several technical reports and provide a comprehensive picture of the Project evaluation.

In a Project of this scope, size, and duration, it was not possible to evaluate all aspects. Therefore, certain areas of possible Project impact have not been included within these components. The omissions are intentional trade-offs, due to severe limitations

---

[1]This component was not intended for the first year of the Project but was started earlier than intended because several of the participating institutions began implementation activities ahead of the timeline. A decision was made to use the Rand Model of educational change in federal innovative projects (Berman and McLaughlin, 1974) as a framework for the change process evaluation.

in resources available. One area not dealt with in this report is the publicity and information sharing efforts of the Project staff at the University; these are described in the Project Annual and Final Report (Hansen & Mills-Novoa, 1978). Evaluation relating to the internal dynamics both at the Project headquarters and in field sites could have generated much useful information, but resources for such systematic study were not available. Some internal process data are available in a case study report on the Project completed by the American Institutes for Research (Fernandes, 1978), as well as in the quarterly and final reports.

Before briefly summarizing first and second year activities for each of the three evaluation components, the report provides an overall description of the Project evaluation for each of the two years.

First year. In the first year of the Project, the internal evaluation team consisted of two 25% time evaluators. One evaluator was responsible for product evaluation, i.e., the evaluation of Project materials developed, while the other evaluator was responsible for change process evaluation and BORN FREE training institute evaluation. As it turned out, the development of Project materials progressed more slowly than expected, while the change process evaluation proved to be more time consuming than originally expected. Both evaluators, but particularly the evaluator responsible for the second and third evaluation components, ended up working hours beyond the time allotted to their 25% positions. Despite the enormity of evaluation tasks, first year technical reports concerning product evaluation and

BORN FREE training institute evaluations were completed by the first quarter of the second year, while the technical reports on change process evaluation were completed in the second quarter of the second year.

Second year. In the second year of the Project, the internal staff consisted of two 50% time evaluators and one 25% time evaluator. The division of tasks remained essentially the same as in the first year, except that the allotted time for evaluation was nearly tripled and that a third 25% time evaluator was brought in to assist the other two evaluators in conducting computer analyses and writing needed quarterly and technical reports. While the same internal evaluator was responsible for product evaluation in the first and second years, the first year change process evaluator resigned at the end of the first year to work on his dissertation, and a new change process evaluator was hired. The transition created some difficulties due in part to the different conceptualizations and evaluation styles of the two process evaluators. Despite the difficulties related to the change in staff, the evaluation design was carried out with some modifications in the second year. A listing of the goals/purposes and procedures/instruments used for each of the three components in the second year evaluation is provided in Appendix Y.

In addition to the tasks related to the three evaluation components, the evaluators also were responsible for conducting a follow-up evaluation of the local institute held the previous summer, evaluation of all-Project meetings, and evaluation of the BORN FREE Dean's

Seminar with College of Education faculty. Besides these tasks, the three part-time evaluators, along with other staff, assisted in non-evaluation tasks such as presentations, writing viewers' guides for videotapes, and tasks related to the National Training Institute in June, 1978.

Purpose of This Report

This report describes the evaluation of the five-day 1978 National Summer Institute. The Institute was a staff development training workshop for educational leaders from every state and territory. Educators from forty-seven states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C. attended the workshop. The workshop served three general purposes: (a) to provide participants with the attitudes, knowledge, and skills to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions; (b) to provide a workshop training model so that these educational leaders could implement BORN FREE goals within their own states; and (c) to provide participants with training materials in the form of learning modules including strategies, videotapes, and guides. During the workshop, participants were exposed to a variety of didactic presentations and experiential activities.

This report concentrates upon evaluation of the workshop training model by national participants. Assessment of other workshops, specific learning materials, videotapes, and change process is the subject of two other separate project evaluation reports. The following sections describe the characteristics of the workshop and participants, examine workshop strengths and weaknesses, and assess the workshop's impact upon the participants. Chapter I provides a brief introduction to the Project along with a description of the Project evaluation design. Chapter II provides a description of

Institute Characteristics. Chapter III describes the Evaluation Methodology used, and Chapters IV and V present an analysis of the Pre-Institute Assessment Data and Post-Institute Assessment Data respectively. Chapter VI presents Conclusions and Recommendations based on the data analysis.

The Appendix includes samples of the Pre-Assessment and Post-Assessment instruments as well as tables summarizing the data. Other materials related to the evaluation design and the Project publications are also included.

II. Institute Characteristics

Objectives

The Project Director and staff developed five primary objectives for the Institute participants. As a result of the workshop, participants were:

1. To increase awareness of one's own attitudes, behavior, and career socialization.
2. To increase knowledge and awareness of sex-role socialization and stereotyping.
3. To increase knowledge of career development concerns and programs as related to sex roles.
4. To increase knowledge and skills in change process and organizational intervention.
5. To increase repertoire of skills and materials in workshop design and training.

Participant Selection

An extensive search for qualified participants began in early spring. At that time, a pool of nominations was solicited from Chief State School Officers, State Higher Education Executive Officers, Deans of Colleges of Education, State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and prominent educators nationwide. A letter written by the Project Director and an endorsement letter by an appropriate professional accompanied the Institute brochure and Project Abstract (see Appendix C for samples).

In addition, a news release about the Institute was distributed to a large number of national professional organizations for their newsletters and newspapers in Minnesota. Unfortunately, the news release was printed very infrequently, and hence, had little effect on applicant response. A more effective means of

eliciting interest in the Project and the Institute was the article entitled, "BORN FREE: A Collaborative Consultation Model for Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping," written by Dr. L. Sunny Hansen, Project Director, and Mr. Dennis Keierleber, first year Evaluator, which appeared in the March 1978 edition of the Personnel and Guidance Journal. Some applicants directly attributed their interest in the Project and Institute to the appearance of this article.

In accordance with the Institute proposal, two participants were chosen from each state and U. S. territory whenever possible. The selection of participants was based on the following criteria:

Potential high impact educational leaders as identified through nominations and references

Team participation of counselors, teachers, and administrators from all education levels

A balance of both sexes, as much as possible

Multiracial and multiethnic representation

Commitment to the goals of BORN FREE (to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping)

Past experience or training in career development, organizational change, and staff development

Commitment to preparing oneself for the workshop by reading selected background materials

Commitment to attend full-day retreat and all workshop activities

Commitment to implement training by planning or conducting follow-up workshops for other educators and parents as a resource person and trainer in home state/territory

On the application panel of the Institute brochure, applicants were asked to briefly describe their leadership roles and background/experience in career development, sex-role stereotyping programs, staff development, or instituting innovative

projects. In addition, they were asked to include a brief statement of why they wanted to attend the Institute. They were also asked to have two persons write letters attesting to their qualifications for this leadership role.

The applications which we received varied on many of the above factors but, for the most part, indicated that the applicants had the potential to have an impact on their home institution and/or state upon their return from the Institute. Although we planned to select two participants from each state, this was not always possible due to the limited number of qualified applicants applying from some of the states. Nonetheless, every state except Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Delaware had representatives at the Institute; Puerto Rico was the only U.S. territory represented along with the District of Columbia.

A total of 107 participants attended and 103 completed evaluations for the National Summer Institute. Each participant received three graduate-level credits in Counseling Psychology/Career Development for completion of the Institute's requirements. A complete description of these participants will be given later in the "Results" section.

Some mail delays in delivery of Institute applications caused problems finalizing the selection process. Telephone calls were necessary to get applications from several states. Although brochures had been sent to at least eight different mailing lists, some populations apparently were not reached. Approximately five persons canceled just prior to the beginning of the Institute, all for personal or family reasons. Some persons selected had heard about the Institute from indirect sources rather than from the mailing.

Institute Staff

The Institute staff consisted of the Project Director, another professor from the University's Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology (CSPP) program, the Project staff, and individuals who were former Project staff members. The Project staff consisted of primarily graduate and advanced graduate students from various University departments (i.e., CSPP, Higher Education, etc.) who were all appointed as graduate assistants. Thirteen current and former staff members (five facilitators were from the first Project year) served as group facilitators during the week of the Institute, and one current staff person served as a full-time evaluator during the Institute. With the exception of the Project Director, there were no nationally known individuals. The basic assumption of the Project is that practicing educators can teach other practicing educators.

In addition to the above Institute staff, a non-University resource person presented on "Racism/Sexism in Career Options." Several field site people also acted as a resource panel to the Institute, bringing with them actual experiences of applied BORN FREE concepts.

The Institute staff met daily during the entire Institute to provide relevant feedback on the workshop conduct, modifications of the schedule, organizational matters, and to discuss certain problem areas. Informal meetings were called as necessary.

Institute Materials

The major materials for the Institute included the two components of career development training materials produced by

the BORN FREE staff over the last two years: the training packets or modules and eight of nine videotapes. In addition to these, three reviews of literature were also introduced along with information on consultation and change process. The module activities are structured group exercises designed to facilitate self-exploration and assessment of participants' beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge of sex-role socialization and stereotyping related to career development. These module activities had been revised several times over the course of the Project, many as a result of actual field-site testing and evaluation. The demonstration of and actual involvement with the various learning strategies, videotapes, and other training materials familiarized the participants with these materials so that they would be able to implement them as they deemed appropriate in their own institutions or state. Of the 200 module activities developed, nine learning strategies and eight videotapes were selected for the Retreat and Institute by the Project planning staff. These did not include the various other presentations, panels, or implementation planning groups, which also were part of the Institute.

The original Project BORN FREE proposal called for the completion and field testing of ten half-hour videotapes concerning different aspects of career development and sex-role socialization for use at the Institute; eight of these were completed for actual use in the Institute, with the reduced goal of nine videotapes produced by the staff by the end of the Project. These tapes were viewed and evaluated by the Institute

participants. In addition, each participant received one set of training packets (one elementary, secondary, and postsecondary/higher education) and supplementary training materials (literature reviews and evaluation reports). Each state received one copy of the BORN FREE overview tape. All of these were to be used as resources for back-home followup activities.

Institute Activities

Appendix B includes the schedule of Retreat and Institute activities. Some changes were made in the schedule as the necessity for change occurred during the week. A summary of the major categories of activities is presented below.

Retreat. The Retreat took place over a full day (8:30 a.m. to 8:30 p.m.) on the campus of Northwestern College, Roseville, Minnesota. Among the purposes of the Retreat were (as stated later in the "Retreat Evaluation" section): 1) to introduce the staff, 2) to provide an opportunity for the participants to meet each other and the staff, 3) to build cohesiveness and relationships, 4) to provide an orientation to Project BORN FREE and program goals, and 5) to introduce concepts and topics relevant to the Project goals, e.g., career development, sex-role stereotyping, socialization, etc.

Presentations. Several topics were presented at the Retreat-Institute including "Career Development Framework for Sex Role Issues," "Systems Approaches to Program Development," "Resistance to Change," and "Racism/Sexism in Career Options." In addition, presentations were made by some of the group facilitators

who had been responsible for originally developing the "Reviews of Literature," and by representatives of some of the 14 original participating institutions who provided a resource panel discussion.

Developmental Growth Groups (DGGs). These small discussion groups averaging about eight people per group provided an important vehicle for the demonstration of various learning strategies as well as providing a relationship-building function. These groups were facilitated by a group leader who was either a current or former Project BORN FREE staff person (see "Institute Staff"). Several of the module activities, e.g., learning strategies, were demonstrated in these group sessions. Through these exercises the participants were also able to assess their own attitudes and feelings concerning career-related sex-role stereotyping. For many, the DGGs served as an Institute support group.

Learning Strategies or Activities. Although the purpose of this subsection is to describe the various strategies used at the Retreat or Institute, no attempt will be made to give a detailed description, as these are readily available in Project BORN FREE: Career Development Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Educational Institutions(Higher Education/Postsecondary Level, Secondary Level and Elementary Level). However, brief descriptions are as follows:

1) Career Life Line: The objective of this learning strategy is to "identify the various stages of career development and the developmental tasks associated with each." The

participant draws a career life line on a large sheet of paper and marks, through the use of special symbols, decisions which have influenced his/her career along with indicating significant others. Discussion is then introduced related to the above.

2) Facilitators/Inhibitors of Career Development: The objective of this exercise is to "identify the limitations which traditional stereotypes of femininity and masculinity placed on career options." The participants responded to several open-ended statements (e.g., "I feel my career development was inhibited because of being female/male...") A group sharing and discussion follows based on structured and unstructured questions.

3) Career Family Tree: The objective of this learning activity is to "relate their (participants') understanding of sex biases and prejudices to their personal values, family background, peer group, and communications with family members regarding the acceptability and appropriateness of career and lifestyle patterns." Participants complete a "Family Occupational Tree" worksheet followed by group discussion (e.g., "What occupation is the most common in your family as far as you know?")

4) Joe Househusband: The objective of this strategy is to "identify the limitations which traditional stereotypes of femininity and masculinity place on career options." The discussion of this activity was changed somewhat from the original model to focus primarily upon the roles and responsi-

bilities of spouses related to household and family responsibilities, including child rearing.

5) Magic Seminar: The objective of this strategy is to "relate their (participants') understanding of sex biases and prejudices to their personal values, family background, peer group, and communications with family members regarding the acceptability and appropriateness of career and lifestyle patterns." In this small group discussion, certain rules are established from the onset (e.g., "no put-downs or evaluations allowed."). Then a cue statement (e.g., "A time I felt good being a man (male)/female (woman)") serves as a topic for discussion.

6) Name Tag/Career Mixer: The purpose of this activity is essentially a structured, fun way for the Institute participants to meet and obtain some preliminary data on each other and the staff. The participant has to acquire as many signatures as possible on a worksheet containing various career-related statements (e.g., "I am engaged in two occupations"), then enter into a short discussion with the person.

Networking of Problems and Solutions. The purpose of this activity was to help the participants find out about common problems and needs and to begin to build a national BORN FREE network so that the participants and others could share resources, expertise, assistance, and support. Lists were developed and posted at the Institute site and later compiled for future dissemination.

Videotapes. Several completed videotapes produced by

Project BORN FREE were viewed by the participants during the Institute. The participants viewed the videotape, "BORN FREE: A World of Options," as a large group during the Retreat. Other tapes viewed during the Institute by subdivided participant groups were "Men: Choices and Changes," "Women: Choices and Changes," "Parenting--Three Generations," "Parents as Influencers," "Why Change?", "Schools as Influencers," and "Colleges as Influencers." A discussion session and written evaluation followed the viewing of each tape.

Implementation Groups. The participants were divided by either region or by state depending upon the number represented from a given locale. These groups were led by a designated facilitator. The purposes of these groups were (1) to provide the participants with implementation methodology and strategies and (2) to have as an outcome of the implementation sessions a personal implementation plan for the participant's institution or state.

Logs. Each day the participants were to record on a relatively simple, one-page form their observations and feelings about the events of the day. These were then given to the facilitators who provided feedback to the participants.

Readings. In addition to the modules (Elementary, Secondary, Higher Education/Postsecondary) disseminated at the Institute, several sets of reading material were mailed out for participant preparation prior to the Institute. Due to an error in mailing these materials at a fourth-class educational rate, many participants did not receive these reading materials. However, duplicate sets were provided at the Institute for those

not receiving them in advance. Briefly, the sets of reading materials were as follows: "A Career Management Model for Counselor Involvement," "BORN FREE: A Collaborative Consultation Model for Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping," "Male is Greater than Female: The Socialization of Status Inequality," "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools," and BORN FREE Literature Review.

III. Evaluation Methodology

Several considerations influenced the design chosen to evaluate the BORN FREE National Summer Institute, 1978. One major evaluative concern was the changes in Institute participants' attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions. As part of the application procedure, participants were asked to briefly describe their leadership roles and background/experience in career development, sex-role stereotyping programs, staff development, or instituting innovative projects. The selected group included a number of persons with apparently extensive backgrounds and interest in these areas (see "Participant Characteristics"). Most standardized sex-role attitude surveys reviewed appeared to have high face validity among items, a high potential for eliciting socially desirable responses, and, as a result, a low probability for identifying meaningful changes among these participants during the Institute.

A second concern was for changes in participants, not only in their attitudes toward sex-roles, but especially in their attitudes, confidence, and abilities to function as change agents in their institutions. Havelock (1973) provides useful definitions of "planned change" and "change agent" as intended for Project BORN FREE. Planned change refers to "change or innovation which comes about through a deliberate process which is intended to make both acceptance by and benefit to the people

who are changed more likely" (p.5). A change agent is "a person who facilitates planned change or planned innovation" (p. 5). As an outcome of the workshop, participants were expected to be better equipped to implement programs to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions or states.

A third consideration was maximizing the amount of information obtained from participants on a variety of subjects in the amount of time allotted for evaluation, both prior to and at the end of the Institute. Because of their length and content, the standardized instruments available were neither feasible nor appropriate for evaluating the workshop. Time limitations also precluded administration of any extensive tests of knowledge.

Pre-Assessment and Post-Assessment Surveys of BORN FREE Institute participants, therefore, were developed to describe and assess a wide range of characteristics of the Institute and its participants. Basic question formats included both single item questions with participant responses on a Likert scale (objective) and open-ended questions (subjective).

Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants

This survey was self-administered by the participants and returned by mail prior to the participants' arrival at the Institute. The participants were informed that all responses would be treated confidentially and that data analysis would be on an aggregate basis. The survey was divided into seven

different sections which are subsumed under the following subheadings. A copy of this survey is provided in Appendix D.

Participant Characteristics. This section provided the Project with the necessary demographic information. Each participant was asked to give his/her age, sex, ethnic background, marital status, spouse's work position and family responsibilities, parental status, and number of female and male children.

Previous Activities and Experience. The participants were asked to provide information on what special training and previous leadership experiences they had in staff development/inservice programs, educational improvement programs, career development/career education programs, and affirmative action/sex discrimination programs. In addition, they were asked what current position they now had as well as how long they had been in that position, and where that position was located. Previous work experience was also noted as well as information about the participant's career development. Each participant was also asked whether or not he/she had read any of the reading materials (see "Readings" in the "Institute Materials" section).

In addition, the participants were asked to provide information about their own institution and state regarding career development and career education, sex-role stereotyping awareness and practices, and related enrollment and financial data which might have an impact on related programs.

Participants were also asked to assess their own present

awarenesses, knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values related to sex-role stereotyping, socialization, change process, and career development and career education.

Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants

This survey was administered to the participants on the last day of the Institute just prior to the closing "wrap up" comments by the participants and staff and the departure. Approximately one-half hour to forty-five minutes was allocated for this task. A copy of the Post-Assessment Survey is located in Appendix D.

Attainment of objectives. This survey was designed to see if the Institute had met its stated objectives (see "Objectives" in "Institute Characteristics"). The participants responded on a Likert scale and provided information as to the degree to which these objectives had been met. The three stated purposes of the Post-Assessment Survey were (1) "to determine the Institute's impact on awareness, knowledge, skills and attitudes/values that were previously measured in the Pre-Assessment Survey," (2) to obtain the participants' evaluation of the Institute (e.g., design, content, processes, etc.), and (3) "to obtain suggestions and recommendations for improving the Institute." The survey consisted of both objective and subjective (open-ended) items.

Institute Impact. Four sections of items were presented which were identical to the comparable sections of the Pre-Assessment Survey. These sections were designed to measure

any change that might have occurred as a result of the Institute in regard to the participants' awareness, knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values related to career development, sex-role stereotyping, sex-role socialization, resources, and so on.

Open-ended questions. These questions were designed to elicit more specific, individual responses in the above areas providing extended evidence of any change that may have occurred.

Ratings of major aspects of the Institute. This section was designed to provide information regarding participant satisfaction with general aspects of the Institute such as "Large Group Presentations," "Developmental Growth Groups," "Housing Arrangements," and so on. The overall Institute was rated as well as separate ratings of the Retreat (one day) and the Institute proper (four days).

Ratings of specific activities within the Institute. The participants were also asked to rate each specific activity presented or experienced at the Institute (e.g., "Presentation: Systems Approaches to Program Development," "Videotape: Why Change?" "Joe Househusband--Developmental Growth Group," and so on. They rated these in terms of the activities' usefulness to the participant.

Open-ended questions regarding the Institute. Finally, the participants were asked to give their responses about their satisfaction with Institute as well as their conclusions and recommendations. These responses are found in Appendix A,

Tables 17-A to 20-A.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and in some cases, modes) were computed for every single objective response category. Frequency distributions, along with relative percentages, are presented where appropriate or applicable throughout the "Results" section. Related tables are located in the Appendix A. A t-test for paired samples was used to compare the mean response scores for those objective items repeated at pre- and post-Institute assessments. T-tests between various Institute participant subgroups were also computed on certain pre-assessment items in order to determine any significant subgroup differences. One-way analysis of variance was also computed between various subgroups on certain items when appropriate. A p-value of .05 or less (2-tailed) was considered statistically significant for this report. Representative responses to the open-ended questions were categorized under each question and used as supportive evidence in the preparation of this report.

All analyses were accomplished via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1977).

Concerning limitations of the analysis, an experimental control group was not employed for comparative purposes. Therefore, differences between pre- and post-Institute assessment scores technically do not mean the Institute "caused" the

differences, only that a change had taken place over a five-day period. However, responses to questions inquiring about the effects of the Institute upon participants offer corroborative support that changes may be attributed to the Institute. Although test-retest reliability indices were not obtained for objective items, consistency of responses to different types of questions concerning similar aspects of the workshop provided convergence for the validity of the results described.

IV. Results--Pre-Assessment*

Pre-Institute Assessment

Participant characteristics. The workshop participants were requested to give information about their personal characteristics, educational background and experience including leadership experiences, institutional background information, and state background information. In addition, self-report information was solicited regarding each participant's knowledge, skills and attitudes/values in a variety of areas.

There were 103 evaluations out of 107 participants representing 47 states, Washington, D.C., and one territory, Puerto Rico. These individuals represented state agencies, universities, secondary schools and technical/vocational schools, in such positions as director of counseling services, staff counselor, vocational equity coordinator, director of women's programming, graduate assistant, assistant professor, counseling psychologist, state career education coordinator, and elementary school counselor. Most of the participants were women (70.9%, N=73). The median age of the participants was 36.5 years with a range of twenty-five to sixty years. Approximately two-thirds of the participants were between 29.6 and 47.0 years.

The ethnic backgrounds of the participants ranged considerably, but most were Caucasian (79.6%, N=82). Other ethnic/racial groups represented were Black (8.7%, N=9), Chicano-Hispanic (3.9%, N=4), Asian-American (2.9%, N=3) and other groups not specifically classified by the survey (4.9%, N=5). As far as marital status, twenty-three were single (22.3%), sixty-one were married (59.2%), fourteen were divorced (13.6%), one was widowed (1.0%) and others (1.9%, N=2).

*Tables summarizing these results are presented in Appendix A.

Most participants were parents (63.1%, N=65) with most parents having either one or two children. Most participants at the workshop had earned either a master's (53.4%, N=55) or a doctorate degree (29.1%, N=30). Other levels of education represented were bachelor's degree (8.7%, N=9), specialist degree (7.8%, N=8) and one post-doctorate degree (1.0%). Almost all of the participants had some previous leadership experiences with eighty (77.7%) indicating experience with staff development/inservice programs, fifty (48.5%) having experience with educational improvement programs sixty-six (64.1%) with career development/career education programs, and forty (38.8%) with affirmative action/sex discrimination programs.

Participants were also asked whether they had read selected reading materials (i.e., "BORN FREE: A Collaborative Consultation Model for Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping"). Most participants had not (80.6%, N=83) as these materials were sent at the educational materials postal rate and had not been received in time.

Institutional and state background information. The workshop participants were asked to give information about their institutional background as well as state background information. Table 2-A summarizes participant responses to these two sets of questions. The participants responded on a four-point scale from "completely disagree" (coded "1") through "mostly disagree" (coded "2") and "mostly agree" (coded "3") to "completely agree" (coded "4"). In addition, there was the option of responding "NA" if the statement did not apply. For the most part, participants slightly less than "mostly agreed" that their institutions had actively and successfully sponsored programs concerned with problems of career development (item 1); the

mean response was 2.813 (SD=.825). When asked about the staff morale at their institution (item 2) the participants responded between "mostly disagree" and "mostly agree" with a mean response of 2.521 (SD=.714). The lowest mean response to a question in the institutional background section referred to how male students in their institutions were aware of and concerned about the limitations sex-role stereotypes placed on their own career development (item 3). The mean response of 1.741 (SD=.710) was below a comparable question relating to how the participant perceived the awareness and concern of most female students about the limiting aspects of sex-role stereotyping on their own career development (item 15). The mean response of 2.302 (SD=.827) on this item shows that the participants believed that female students are somewhat more concerned and aware of sex-role stereotypes limiting their career development than are male students, although both mean responses were both in the "disagree" range.

The participants' mean response to whether they believed that the economic situation of their institution would significantly limit the number of activities that could be employed to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices (item 4) was 2.473 (SD=.842) meaning that some apparently "mostly agreed" and others "mostly disagreed." The participants stated via a mean response of 2.000 (SD=.752) that most of the staff within their institution were not very concerned about how their sex-role stereotyping attitudes and practices may limit career options of students (item 6). This may in part be related to the time demands upon the staff (item 7) as some "mostly agreed" and others "mostly disagreed" with this item; the mean response was 2.667 (SD=.691). The participants "mostly agreed" that there are

many practices in their institutions that encourage sex-role stereotyping for male (item 8) and female (item 13) students; the respective mean responses were 3.067 (SD=.761) and 2.880 (SD=.724). When asked about their institution's policies and practices being responsive and open to change and the ease in which change could be made (item 9) the participants "mostly disagreed" that this could be done without making substantial and disruptive changes in the system; the mean response was 2.375 (SD=.785). The participants "mostly disagreed" that the female (item 5) and male (item 10) staff within their institutions were aware of and concerned about how sex-role stereotypes can limit their own career development with males somewhat less aware and concerned than females. The respective mean responses were 1.917 (SD=.749) and 2.677 (SD=.814). Participants believed that for the most part there was not considerable tension between male and female staff in their institutions relative to sex bias and discrimination issues (item 11). The mean response was 2.220 (SD=.772). They also "mostly disagreed" that their institutions had actively and successfully sponsored programs concerned with problems of sex bias and discrimination (item 12); the mean response was 2.305 (SD=.888).

Some trainees "mostly agreed" and others "mostly disagreed" that their institution is facing or will be facing an immediate crisis that would overshadow all other issues of concerns such as career-related sex-role stereotyping (item 14); the mean response to this item was 2.462 (SD=.916). Finally, the participants were asked about their perceptions of their institution's support to openly and actively reduce sex-role stereotyping attitudes and practices that may limit the career development of students (item 16). The mean response of 2.979 (SD=.729) indicates that the participants "mostly agreed" that institutional support would be given.

Participants were also requested to provide background information about their state relative to career education, redressing sex inequalities and discrimination legislation, enrollment, and also related finances. When asked to give their perceptions about their states' legislature relative to the issues of redressing sex inequalities and sex discrimination (item 1), 55.4% (N=57) either "mostly agreed" or "completely agreed" that their legislatures had given very little priority to this issue; the mean response to this item was 2.798 (SD=.850). Participants were asked to compare what they believed their state spent on public education with other states. Many (49.5%, N=51) agreed that their state spent at least as much as, if not more than, what most other states spent. The mean response to this item (2) was 2.570 (SD=1.046). Two items requested information about career education programs in the participants' states. They were asked whether the issue of career education was given top priority throughout their state with substantial state funds allocated or available for developing or improving career education or career development programs (item 3). The responses to this item were for the most part split with 42.7% (N=44) either "mostly agreeing" or "completely agreeing" and 49.6% (N=51) either "mostly disagreeing" or "completely disagreeing." More participants disagreed (48.6%, N=50) than agreed (38.8%, N=40) that their state had a comprehensive "career education" plan in which the influence of sex-role stereotyping in a person's career development was recognized and addressed; the mean response to this item (4) was 2.511 (SD=.864). The participants either "mostly agreed" (31.1%, N=32) or "completely agreed" (21.4%, N=22) while 25.2% (N=26) "mostly disagreed" and only 5.8% (N=6)

"completely disagreed" that enrollment would decline at their educational institutions with resulting negative side effects. The mean response to item 5 was 2.814 (SD=.901). The negative effects of declining enrollment seem to be an important factor to more than half of the workshop participants. Most of the participants (49.5%, N=51) believed that their state's educational institutions were very supportive of title IX (Affirmative Action) both in the letter and the spirit of the law (item 6), while 34.0% (N=35) did not; the mean response was 2.581 (SD=.833). They were also approximately split with 39.8% (N=.41) either "completely" or "mostly disagreeing" and 32.0% (N=33) either "mostly agreeing" or "completely agreeing" on the belief that their states' top education officials would be willing to support via funding extensive inservice training of state educators to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices (item 7); the mean response to this item was 2.816 (SD=1.454).

In statistical analyses for tests between various groups in responses to these pre-assessment survey questions about the participant's institution and state background information some significant differences were found. There were no significant differences between males and females or in marital status on these responses. Participants who were parents believed more strongly that career education should be given top priority for funding by their states (State Background Information: Item 3, p=.024) versus participants who were not parents. Those who had previous leadership experience in staff development or inservice programs believed their staffs were very concerned about how their sex-role stereotyping attitudes and practices could limit the career options of their students (Institutional Background Information: Item 6, p=.048) versus those who had not had these

experiences. This group also stated that their state had a comprehensive "career education" plan in which the influence of one's career development was recognized and addressed (State Background Informaion: Item 4, p=.030) versus those who had not had staff development or inservice leadership experience. Those whose leadership experience included career development or career education programs (Institutional Background Information: Item 3, p=.004) believed more strongly that most males in their institution were aware and concerned about how sex-role stereotypes can limit their own career options compared with those who had not had this type of leadership experience. Those participants who had previous leadership experience in affirmative action or sex discrimination programs (Institutional Background Information: Item 13, p=.014) believed there were many more practices in their institution that encouraged sex-role stereotyping for female students than those who had not had this kind of experience. Younger (twenty-five to thirty-three years, N=29) and older (forty-three to sixty years, N=32) participants tended to believe that the current economic situation of their institution would significantly limit the number of activities that could be employed to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices (Institutional Background Information: Item 4, F=4.331, p=.016) compared with the middle age range group (thirty-four to forty-two years, N=32). Ethnic minorities generally rated the statement that most male students in their institutions were aware of and concerned about how sex-role stereotypes can limit their own development (Institutional Background Information: Item 3, F=4.224, p=.004) higher than Caucasians, but generally rated the effect of the current

economic situation of their institution and how this would limit activities that could be employed to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices (Institutional Background Information, Item 4, F=2.607, p=.041) lower than Caucasians. Individuals with a master's degree (N=46) agreed more that their state spends at least as much if not more on public education than what other states spend (State Background Information: Item 2, F=2.774, p=.032) as compared with other levels of highest degree obtained by the participant.

Previous activities and experiences. The Institute participants were asked several questions in order to determine the general level of present awareness, knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values of career development, sex-role stereotyping, and related areas possessed by each participant prior to the first set of questions which referred to their present awareness in various areas, which is summarized in Table 3-A. The participants responded on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all aware" (coded "1") through "slightly aware" (coded "2"), "moderately aware" (coded "3"), "quite aware" (coded "4"), to "extremely aware" (coded "5"). When asked about their awareness of their own career development, 81.6 (N=84) responded that they were either "quite" or "extremely aware" of their own career development (item 1); the mean response on this item was 4.146 (SD=.821). Nearly as many participants (78.1%, N=81) stated that they were "quite" or "extremely aware" of their own sex-role socialization (item 2) with 16.5% (N=17) and 4.9% (N=5) stating they were "moderately aware" and "slightly aware," respectively; the mean response was 4.146 (SD=.868). When asked about their awareness of the influence of sex-role stereotypes on their own career development (item 3), the mean response

of 3.951 (SD=1.004) was consistent with items 1 and 2. More than three-fourths (75.7%, N=78) were either "quite aware" or "extremely aware." All participants (96.1%, N=99) were at least "slightly aware" or better of their attitudes concerning sex differences and traditional sex roles versus androgyny (item 4) with 68.9% (N=71) either "quite aware" or "extremely aware;" the mean response to this item was 3.796 (SD=1.132). Most participants (69.9%, N=72) were either "quite aware" or "extremely aware" of their own sex-role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work (item 5) with 23.3%, N=24) reporting that they were "moderately aware;" the mean response to this item was 3.816, (SD=.926). Nearly all of the participants (82.6%, N=85) stated that they were at least "moderately aware" of sex-role stereotyping practices in their institution that limit the career options of students (item 6) and that 55.4% (N=57) were either "quite aware" or "extremely aware;" the mean response to this item was 3.466 (SD=1.170). More than half of the participants (52.4%, N=54) stated that they were either "quite aware" or "extremely aware" of practices in their institutions that broaden career options of students (item 7); the mean response was 3.427 (SD=1.193). Again, most participants (80.6%, N=83) were at least "moderately aware" of the resources which are available in their institutions that could be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices (item 8) with 40.8% (N=42) either "quite aware" or "extremely aware." the mean response to this item was 3.330 (SD=1.014). As expected, these participants were, for the most part, aware of barriers within their institutions that inhibit their efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices; the number responding "moderately aware" was thirty-six (35.0%), "quite

aware" was thirty-five (34.0%) and "extremely aware," fourteen (13.6%). The mean response to this item (9) was 3.398 (SD=1.013). Fewer participants were aware of resources which are available in their states (item 10) as compared within their institutions (item 8) that could be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in their institutions, with only 22.4% (N=23) either "quite aware" or "extremely aware" of available state resources. More than three-fourths (77.7%, N=80) of the participants were "moderately aware," "slightly aware," or "not at all aware" of available state resources. The mean response to item 10 was 2.777 (SD=1.084). In addition, most participants (75.7%, N=78) were only "moderately aware," "slightly aware," or "not aware at all" while only 17.3% (N=24) were either "quite aware" or "extremely aware" of the barriers in their state that would inhibit efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in their educational institution; the mean response to this item (11) was 2.699 (SD=1.128). Apparently, and as one might expect, the participants were more aware of institutional than state barriers and resources.

In statistical analyses for tests between various groups additional significant differences were found. Women were significantly more aware than men of their own sex-role socialization (item 2, p=.021), the influence of sex-role stereotypes on their career development (item 3, p=.000), their attitudes concerning sex differences and traditional sex roles versus androgyny (item 4, p=.016), and their own sex-role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work (item 5, p=.031). Participants who had previous leadership experience in staff development or inservice

programs were more aware of barriers in the state which inhibit efforts to reduce sex-role stereotyping in educational institutions than those who did not have this experience (item 11, p=.014). In addition, participants who had previous leadership experience in educational improvement programs were significantly more aware than those who did not of their own sex-role socialization (item 2, p=.014), the influence of sex-role stereotypes on their career development (item 3, p=.024), and of barriers within their state which inhibit efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions (item 11, p=.035). Those participants who had previous leadership experiences in career development or career education programs were more aware than those participants who did not have these experiences of practices at their institution that broaden the career options of students (item 7, p=.009). Those participants who had previous leadership experience with affirmative action programs or sex discrimination programs versus those who had not were apparently the most aware subgroup present at the Institute. They were significantly more aware of their own sex-role socialization (item 2, p=.001), the influence of sex-role stereotypes on their career development (item 3, p=.011), their attitudes concerning sex differences, traditional sex roles versus androgyny (item 4, p=.008), sex=role stereotyping practices at their institutions which inhibit a student's career options (item 6, p=.013), practices which broaden career options of students (item 7, p=.048), available institutional resources (item 8, p=.003), institutional barriers (item 9, p=.000), available state resources (item 10, p=.001), and state barriers (item 11, p=.001).

The oldest age range group (forty-three to sixty years) were significantly more aware of sex-role practices in their institution that limit the career options of students as compared with the youngest age range group (twenty-five to thirty-three years), or the middle age range group (thirty-four to forty-two years) (F=3.7060, p=.028). There were no significant differences on levels of reported awareness for any item in this section between different ethnic, marital, or level of education (degree) subgroups.

Participants were also assessed on the level of knowledge (Table 4-A) each had in several areas. The participants responded on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all knowledgeable" (coded "1"), "slightly knowledgeable" (coded "2"), "moderately knowledgeable" (coded "3"), "quite knowledgeable" (coded "4"), and "extremely knowledgeable" (coded "5"). The first area assessed was knowledge about career development concepts and applications (item 1). More than one-half (52.4%, N=54) of the participants were only "moderately" or "slightly knowledgeable" or "not knowledgeable at all" with 45.7% (N=47) either "quite knowledgeable" or "extremely knowledgeable." The mean response of 3.330 (SD=1.052) demonstrated, however, that most respondents had some knowledge of career development concepts and applications. Of these participants 10.7% (N=9) had no knowledge or were only "slightly knowledgeable" of the sex-role socialization process with 40.8% (N=42) "moderately knowledgeable," 33.0% (N=34) "quite knowledgeable," and 15.5% (N=16) "extremely knowledgeable;" the mean response to this item (2) was 3.524 (SD=.906). Participants were the most knowledgeable of the influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development (item 3). The mean response to this item was 3.738 (SD=.828) with 61.1% (N=63) either "quite" or

"extremely knowledgeable," 33.0% (N=34) "moderately knowledgeable," 5.8% (N=6) "slightly knowledgeable" and no participant without some knowledge of the influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development. Item 4 assessed the participants' knowledge of androgyny and sex-role transcendence and had a mean response of 3.097 (SD=1.089). Only 9.7% (N=10) of the participants were "extremely knowledgeable" with more than one-half (57.3%, N=59) either "quite knowledgeable" or "moderately knowledgeable" of androgyny and sex-role transcendence. Particularly important for purposes of this assessment was whether these participants were knowledgeable of techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes (item 5). The mean reasponse to this item (5) was 2.786 (SD=1.016) and was the lowest in the section for assessment of the participant's present knowledge. More than two-fifths (43.7%, N=45) of the participants were either only "slightly knowledgeable" or "not knowledgeable at all" about these techniques with 20.4% (N=21) "quite knowledgeable," and only 4.9% (N=5) "extremely knowledgeable." Most (70.8%, N=73) participants were either "moderately knowledgeable" or "quite knowledgeable," however, of change process principles (item 6); the mean response to this item was 3.204 (SD=.933). Finally, participants were assessed on their level of knowledge of program development principles (item 7). About one-third (35.0%, N=36) of the participants were either "quite" or "extremely knowledgeable" of program development principles (item 7) with 43.7% (N=45) "moderately knowledgeable," 16.5% (N=17) "slightly knowledgeable," and only 2.9% (N=3) "not at all knowledgeable."

In statistical analyses for differences between groups several significant differences were found. Women were more

knowledgeable than men about the influence of sex-roles and stereotypes on career development (item 3, p=.048) as well as about techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes (item 5, p=.039). Participants who were parents were more knowledgeable about sex-role socialization processes than non-parent participants (item 2, p=.042). Participants who had previous leadership experience in staff development or inservice programs were more knowledgeable than those who had not had this experience about androgyny and sex-role transcendence (item 4, p=.001), principles of change process (item 6, p=.034), and principles of program development (item 7, p=.003). Those participants who had previous leadership experience with educational improvement programs were more knowledgeable than those who had not had this experience about androgyny and sex-role transcendence (item 4 , p=.017) and principles of change process (item 6, p=.022). Those who had previous leadership experience in career development or career education programs were, as expected, more knowledgeable about career development concepts and applications (item 1, p=.000), and principles of program development (item 7, p=.004). Those participants who had previous affirmative action or leadership experience in sex discrimination programs were apparently the most knowledgeable subgroup (as well as the most aware) being significantly more knowledgeable than those who had not had these experiences except in the area of career development concepts and applications. Those participants in the older age range group (forty-three to sixty years) were significantly more knowledgeable about the sex-role socialization process (item 2, F=3.203, p=.045) and about the influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development (item 3, F=3.498, p=.034) as compared with either the

younger age range group (twenty-five to thirty-three years) or the middle age range group (thirty-four to forty-two years). There were no significant differences on the pre-assessment survey questions about the participants' present knowledge between different ethnic, marital, or level of education (degree) subgroups.

The participants were also requested to give information about their level of present skills in several relevant areas. The Institute participants responded on a five-point scale (Table 5-A) ranging from "not at all skillful" (coded "1"), through "slightly skillful" (coded "2"), "moderately skillful" (coded "3"), "quite skillful" (coded "4") to "extremely skillful" (coded "5"). The participants were asked if they were skillful in the self-analysis regarding their own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors (item 1). Eight (7.8%) participants stated that they were "extremely skillful" in this self-analysis with 48.5% (N=50) "quite skillful," 32.0% (N=33) "moderately skillful," 8.7% (N=9) "slightly skillful," and only 2.9% (N=3) "not at all skillful." The mean response to item 1 was 3.495 (SD=.873). They were also asked to state their level of skill in recognizing and challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals (item 2). Most participants (74.8%, N=77) stated they were either "moderately skillful" or "quite skillful" with 14.6% (N=15) saying they were "slightly skillful" or "not at all skillful." Only 9.7% (N=10) stated that they were "extremely skillful;" the mean response to this item (2) was 3.330 (SD=.974). The third item assessed the level of skill in conducting a system diagnosis of their institution and state needs. The mean response to this

item (3) was 2.136 (SD=1.085). Most of the participants reported that they were either "not at all skillful" (29.1%, N=30) or "slightly skillful" (32.0%, N=33) with 25.2% (26) reporting that they were "moderately skillful" and only 10.6% (N=11) said that they were either "quite skillful" or "extremely skillful." The participants reported that they were not very skillful at locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan (item 4) with about one-half of the participants either "not at all skillful" (14.6%, N=15) or only "slightly skillful" (35.9%, N=37). Of these 27.2% (N=28) responded that they were "moderately skillful" with only a total of 22.3% (N=23) either "quite skillful" or "extremely skillful;" the mean response to this item (4) was 2.631 (SD=1.102). The Institute participants were then assessed on their level of skill in motivating educators to reduce their sex-role stereotyping practices (item 5). Most (44.7%, N=46) believed that they were "moderately skillful" in their ability to do this with 41.7% (N=43) believing they were less skillful and 11.7% (N=12) believing they were more skillful. The mean response to this item (5) was 2.524 (SD=.948). Finally, all participants were assessed on their self-reported skills in training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions (item 6). Almost one-half stated they were either "not at all skillful" or only "slightly skillful" and 45.6% (N=47) said they were either "moderately skillful" or "quite skillful" with only 2.9% (N=3) being "extremely skillful."

Statistical analyses for differences between groups were performed and additional significant differences were found between different subgroups on the level of skill in the previously mentioned areas. Women were significantly more skillful than men in locating and utilizing available resources needed for an intervention plan (item 4, p=.037), and in training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions (item 6, p=.003). Those participants with a Specialist degree were significantly more skillful than the other degree groups in recognizing and challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals (item 2, F=3.715, p=.007). This may be the result of specialized training in the relevant skill areas. There were no significant differences on these items among age, ethnic, or marital subgroups.

Those participants who had previous leadership experiences in staff development or inservice programs reported that they were significantly more skillful in recognizing and challenging the sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals (item 2, p=.036), conducting a system diagnosis of their institutional and state needs (item 3, p=.020), and locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan (item 4, p=.009). Those participants who had previous leadership experiences in educational improvement programs stated that they were more skillful in recognizing and challenging the sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals (item 2, p=.033). Participants who reported that they had previous leadership experiences in affirmative action or sex discrimination programs

were significantly more skillful in all previously mentioned areas except in motivating educators to reduce their sex-role stereotyping practices.

Finally, the participants were assessed on their present attitudes or values in six different areas. The participants responded on a four-point scale ranging from "completely disagree" (coded "1") through "mostly disagree" (coded "2"), and "mostly agree" (coded "3") to "completely agree" (coded "4"), Table 6-A. Mean self-reported levels were considerably higher in this section when compared with the other sections of the pre-assessment survey. The participants were asked if they believed that the issue of sex-role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females (item 1). Almost all the respondents either "completely agreed" (84.5%, N=87) or "mostly agreed" (11.7%, N=12) with only three participants (2.9%) either "mostly disagreeing" or "completely disagreeing;" the mean response to this item (1) was 3.814 (SD=.502). When asked if the concept of career should include both work and family, 91.3% (N=94) "completely agreed," 6.8% (N=7) stated that they "mostly agreed," and only one person (1.0%) "completely disagreed." The mean response to item 2 was 3.902 (SD=.386). The participants were also asked if they believed the issue of career development and sex-role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in their states (item 3). A mean response of 3.853 (SD=.431) indicates that most participants believed this issue was extremely important. Only one individual (1.0%) "completely disagreed" with this issue, and the remainder (98.1%, N=101) either "completely agreed" or "mostly agreed." Most participants (95.1%, N=98)

agreed that they were committed to continually monitoring their own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behavior (item 4) with only three (2.9%) participants disagreeing; the mean response to this item was 3.752 (SD=.573). Then the respondents were assessed on their attitudes about their committment to challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of others (item 5). Almost one-half either "completely agreed" (45.6%, N=47) or "mostly agreed" (50.5%, N=52) with this item. Only three participants (2.9%) either "mostly" or "completely disagreed;" the mean response to this item (5) was 3.412 (SD=.619). Finally, the participants were assessed on their feelings of confidence that they would be able to make changes in their institution and state that would result in expanded career options for all their students (item 6). Most participants (54.4%, N=56) "mostly agreed" that they could make these changes, with 24.3% (N=25) "completely agreeing," and 16.5% (N=17) either "mostly disagreeing" or "completely disagreeing;" the mean response to this item (6) was 3.061 (SD=.701).

Statistical analyses for differences between groups were performed and additional significant differences were found between different subgroups on the level of attitude or values in the previously mentioned areas. Male participants' attitudes or values about the issue of sex-role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females was significantly higher when compared with female participants (item 1, p=.048), although both sexes rated this issue extremely high. Those participants who had read the materials sent to them prior to coming to the Institute were significantly less confident that they would be able to make any needed changes in their institution and state

that would result in expanded career options for students (item 6, p=.039) compared with those who had not. Blacks rated the issue of sex-role stereotyping being equally important for both males and females significantly lower than the other ethnic subgroups (item 1, F=2.602, p=.041). As the level of education (highest degree obtained by the participant) increased, the commitment to continually monitoring their own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors (item 4, F=7.890, p=.000) and the participants' commitment to challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of others (item 5, F=5.308, p=.001) also increased significantly. Participants who had previous leadership experiences in educational improvement programs believed that the concept of career should include both work and family (item 2, p=.045) as compared with those who had not had these experiences. There were no significant differences on these items for any of the parent, age, or marital subgroups.

V. Results--Post-Assessment*

Post-Institute Assessment

In order to determine how effective the Institute was in meeting the five objectives stated in the Institute Characteristics section, a t-test analysis was performed to assess any significant mean difference between the participants' responses prior to the Institute and after the Institute on paired items. The assessed areas were present awareness where responses were made on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all aware" (coded "1") through "extremely aware" (coded "5"), present knowledge on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all knowledgeable" (coded "1") to "extremely knowledgeable" (coded "5"), present skills on a five-point scale ranging from "not at all skillful" (coded "1") to "extremely skillful" (coded "5"), and present attitudes/values on a four-point scale ranging from "completely disagree" (coded "1") to "completely agree" (coded "4").

Table 7-A, "Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments," illustrates that there was a significant difference between pre- and post-assessment in all areas of present awareness except in the participants' awareness of their own career development (item 1, p=.065). The largest gains were in the participants' awareness of their attitudes concerning sex differences, and traditional sex roles versus androgyny (difference between post-assessment and pre-assessment means was .6311), awareness of resources available in the participants' state that could be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions (mean difference equalled

*Tables summarizing these results are presented in Appendix A.

.5922), awareness of barriers within the participants' state that would inhibit efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions (mean difference equalled .5446), awareness of barriers within the participants' institution that would inhibit the participants' efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices (mean difference equalled .4660), and participants' awareness of their own sex-role stereotyping practices at home and at work (mean difference equalled .4466).

It seems that the Institute's primary impact on the participants was related to an increased awareness of institutional and state barriers, and available state resources, as well as an increased awareness of one's own personal attitudes relevant to sex-role stereotyping.

Significant differences were also obtained in the pre- and post-assessment of the participants' level of present knowledge. All paired items in this section produced significant differences between pre- and post-means. Table 8-A illustrates that the Institute had a significant impact on the level of the participants' present knowledge about career development concepts and applications (mean difference = .5466, p = .000), the sex-role socialization process (mean difference = .5743, p = .000), the influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development (mean difference = .5743, p =.000), present knowledge about androgyny and sex-role transcendence (mean difference = .8100, p = .000), about techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes (mean difference = 1.1980, p = .000), about principles of change process (mean difference = .6634, p = .000), and knowledge about the

principles of program development (mean difference = .8020, p = .000).

It is important to note that the greatest gain in this section was in the area of knowledge about techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes. This relates specifically to the overall goals of the Institute and the BORN FREE Project of providing a workshop training model and training materials in the form of strategies, videotapes, etc. It would seem that relative to these ends, these primary goals have been met.

Table 9-A illustrates that significant gains were also obtained in every area assessed regarding the participants' level of present skills. The participants had improved in their continuous self-analysis regarding their own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors (mean difference = .6139, p = .000), in recognizing and challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals (mean difference = .5300, p = .000), in conducting a system diagnosis of their institution and state needs (mean difference = 1.1300, p = .000), in locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan (mean difference = 1.1485, p = .000), and in an increased level of skill in motivating educators to reduce their sex-role stereotyping practices (mean difference = .9703, p = .000). As is apparent, the largest gain was made in the area of locating available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan. This would seem to reflect the Project's impact in providing the various instructional materials and media to the participants which would be relevant to implementing an intervention plan in their institution or state. In addition, a significant impact was

noted in the change in the level of skill of the participants in conducting a systems diagnosis of their institution and state needs. This is most likely the result of the various activities, which were implemented at the Institute through planned discussion and resource groups.

As far as a comparison of the differences between pre- and post-assessment on the participants' present attitudes and values, only two of six areas assessed produced significant pre- and post-differences. However, as can be seen in Table 10-A, the levels of present attitudes and/or values about sex-role stereotyping, career development, were already (pre-assessment) extremely high and in the "completely agree" (coded "4") range. Areas where no significant changes occurred were the beliefs that the issue of sex-role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females (mean difference = .0196, $p = .787$), that the concept of career should include both work and family (mean difference = -.0294, $p = .650$), that the issue of career development and sex-role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in their states (mean difference = .0099, $p = .885$), and the feeling of being committed to continually monitoring their own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors (mean difference = .0891, $p = .259$). So as can be seen in Table 10-A there were virtually no differences on the first items. However, significant increases did occur in the participants' attitudes about being committed to challenging the sex-role stereotyping practices of others (mean difference = .2000, $p = .018$) and an increase in confidence that the participant would be able to make needed changes in their institution that would result in

expanded career options for all students (mean difference = -.2371, p = .006). Apparently, the Institute was quite impactful in all areas relevant to the goals and objectives of the Institute where any possible improvement could be made.

Tables 11-A through 14-A summarize the descriptive statistics from the Post-Assessment Survey in the areas of present awareness, present knowledge, present skills, and present attitudes/values. These statistical values were used, along with the comparable pre-assessment items, in the comparative analyses of pre- and post-assessment items previously described.

Major Aspects of the Institute

The participants also rated the major aspects of the Institute as well as rating the specific activities within the Institute. The major aspects of the Institute were assessed on a six-point scale ranging from "very dissatisfied" (coded "1"), "dissatisfied" (coded "2"), "mostly dissatisfied" (coded "3"), "mostly satisfied" (coded "4"), and "satisfied" (coded "5"), to "very satisfied" (coded "6"); (see Table 15-A).

Two very critical summary ratings were the overall participant evaluations of the one-day retreat on Tuesday and the Institute itself which took place over four days, Wednesday through Saturday. Over half of the participants were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" (50.5%, N=52) and over one-third stated that they were "mostly satisfied" with the one-day Retreat. Only one-tenth (10.7%, N=11) were either "mostly dissatisfied" (3.9%, N=4), "dissatisfied" (4.9%, N=5) or "very dissatisfied" (1.9%, N=2) with the Retreat. This response indicates that the participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with the Retreat. Of course, a more detailed analysis of the Retreat and its specific activities is important in order to see what aspects or activities of the Retreat were most impactful or effective from the participants' perspectives. This is an appropriate place to interject the separate Retreat evaluation into the overall report. The Project BORN FREE Retreat Evaluation Form was responded to separately immediately at the end of the one-day Retreat (See Table 1-A). Most of the items were adapted from the regular Workshop Evaluation Form created to evaluate local workshops in field site settings.

Retreat Evaluation

Essentially, there were no significant differences noted, as expected, relative to participant characteristics between the pre-assessment survey and the Retreat Evaluation Form. However, the participants were asked to classify themselves a little differently as compared with the pre-assessment survey. As far as an occupational classification, sixteen (15.4%) said that they were teachers of one kind or another, thirty (28.8%) were counselors, thirty-three (31.7%) worked as administrators, and nineteen (18.3%) perceived themselves in roles other than the first three categories. Most (65.4%, N=68) worked in a post-secondary or higher education setting or had a major responsibility relative to this level. Four (3.8%) considered themselves at the elementary level and seventeen (16.3%) at the secondary level. For additional analysis on participant characteristics see the previous section on pre-assessment survey analysis, "Participant Characteristics."

The Retreat Evaluation Form assessed the participants in the areas of feelings about the physical characteristics of the Retreat, organization, goals, the presenters, activities, maintenance functions, and overall impact. All of these areas were important to the general purposes of the Retreat. Among the purposes of the Retreat were: (1) to introduce the staff, (2) to provide an opportunity for the participants to meet each other and the staff, (3) to build cohesiveness and relationships, (4) to provide an orientation to Project BORN FREE and program goals, and (5) to introduce concepts and topics relevant to the Project goals, i.e., career development, sex-role stereotyping, via large and small group presentations or interaction, individual

networking and mixing activities, and a videotape presentation.

The purpose of this section is not to describe the particular activities, i.e., Career Mixer, but to analyze the participants' feelings about such activities and the other aforementioned areas. The activities and presentations themselves were described previously in the "Workshop Materials" and "Workshop Activities" sections.

The participants were asked about the Retreat site, Northwestern College, and if the site was appealing, attractive, and well located, and if the participants felt comfortable in the Retreat surroundings. They evaluated the site characteristics on a scale ranging from "1" to "6" where the "1" end of the continuum was "quite poor" and the "6" end "superior." The mean response to this item was 5.615 (SD=.828) with 72.1% (N=75) responding "6" and 23.1% (N=24) responding "5." It is fairly obvious that the participants were extremely happy with the selection of Retreat site.

The participants were assessed on their belief that the Retreat was well organized relative to such areas as the agenda, activity scheduling, presentations, sufficient time, breaks and so forth. Organization was assessed on a scale of "1" to "6" where the "1" end of the continuum represented "very poorly organized" and the "6" end was "extremely well organized." The largest percentage of participants (46.2%, N=48) responded "5" with 15.4% (N=16) responding "6" and 20.2% (N=21), "4." The mean response to this item was 4.588 (SD=1.008). This would seem to indicate that for the most part, participants believed the workshop was well organized.

Two additional questions related to the assessment of each participant's feelings of certain maintenance functions at the Retreat. Essentially, they were assessed on such group process attributes as the openness of the participants in general, that the Retreat climate was open, trusting, and that information flowed freely among the participants. For lack of a better summary descriptor, this will be called maintenance attribute #1. Maintenance attribute #2 related to the participants' feelings that whenever they had a contribution to make, they had an opportunity to make it. These specific attributes were particularly important in light of the previously mentioned goals of the Retreat and also because there was actual small group activity which served as a primary vehicle moving the participants in the direction of the Retreat goals. More than four-fifths of the participants (84.7%, N=88) rated maintenance attribute #1 at "5" or "6" on a scale ranging from "1," "almost never," to "6," "almost always." In addition, 63.5% (N=66) and 28.8% (N=30) of the participants rated maintenance attribute #2, "6" and "5," respectively. The mean responses to items concerned with maintenance attributes #1 and #2 were 5.330 (SD=.821) and 5.538 (SD=.696), respectively.

The presenters were evaluated on their knowledge and competency on a six point scale continuum ranging from "1" on the lower end, "not at all" knowledgeable and competent, to "6" on the upper end, "superior." The presenters consisted mainly of the current 1977-78 Project BORN FREE University staff, previous personnel from the 1976-77 academic year, and special resource people brought in to make presentations on specific topics. (For

a more detailed description see "Introduction, Workshop Staff"). About two-thirds (69.3%, N=72) rated the presenters at "5" or "6" believing them to be "superior" in general. Others rated the presenters on this attribute "3" (6.7%, N=7) and "4" (20.2%, N=21). Some of the middle range ratings may reflect that the types and length of presenter training varied considerably with, for example, some having more extensive and intensive group process skills as compared with other presenters. But, overall the ratings reflect superiorly trained presenters. Directly related to the presenters themselves was what they presented, the content and activities. The participants were assessed on whether they felt the content and activities were interesting. More than three-fourths (78.8%, N=82) responded either "6" (37.5%, N=39) or "5" (41.3%, N=43) with an additional 11.5% (N=12) responding "4." This would indicate that the participants were provided with interesting content and activities (see "Introduction: Workshop Activities") during the Retreat.

Regarding the individual activities or presentations at the Retreat the following is a statistical description of each. All activities and presentations were rated on a six point scale where the "1" end of the continuum indicated "very poor" and the "6" end of the continuum indicated "extremely well done." For each activity/presentation, the modal or most common response is given as well as the mean or average response. The activities/presentations were as follows: Career Mixer: the mean response was 4.520 (SD=1.114) with a mode of five (40.4%, N=42); BORN FREE Institute overview: the mean response was 4.891 (SD=.915) with a mode of 5 (46.2%, N=48); Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development: the mean response was 4.634 (SD=.946) with a mode of five

(38.5%, N=40); Career Development Framework: the mean response was 4.810 (SD=.907) with a mode of five (43.3%, N=45); Career Life Line: the mean response was 4.686 (SD=1.108) with a mode of five (35.6%, N=37); Videotape: "World of Options": the mean response was 4.757 (SD=.955) with a mode of five (42.3%, N=44); Resource Networking of Problems and Solutions: the mean response was 4.563 (SD=1.250) with a mode of six (27.9%, N=29); Magic Seminar: the mean response was 4.677 (SD=1.081) with a mode of five (30.8%, N=32). "Masculine/Feminine," a poetry reading, was also scheduled into the program, but was not read due to a lack of time. All of these activities/presentations were, for the most part, rated from a neutral range to "extremely well done." Those with the highest mean response were the BORN FREE Institute overview and the Career Development Framework. Both large group presentations were central to the theme and goals of the Retreat, and were delivered by the Project Director. In addition, those activities were also ranked by the participants. They were ranked on a scale ranging from "1," which was the highest rank, to "8," which was the lowest rank. However, only seven activities were ranked, as the "Masculine/Feminine" reading was not presented. The BORN FREE Institute overview received the highest rank (mean rank response = 3.426, SD=2.148), mode = 1.0). The second highest rank was obtained by the videotape presentation: "World of Options" (mean rank response = 4.011, SD=2.117, mode = 3.0). The third highest rank was received by the "Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development" Activity (mean rank response = 4.021, SD=1.989, mode = 4.0). The lowest mean rank was received by the Career Mixer activity (mean rank response = 5.500, SD=2.163, mode = 7.0). Probably those activities ranked highest or lowest

are the most important in providing information regarding the impact of the exercise or activity on the participant.

The last overall area measured by the Retreat Evaluation Form assessed the participants feelings about whether or not the goals of the Retreat had been met and the impact of the Retreat on the participant. When asked if the participant believed that the goals of the Retreat were clear, 18.3% (N=19) responded "6," or "extremely clear," with 37.5% (N=39) responding "5." Another 23.1% (N=24) responded "4." Most participants did, therefore, believe that the overall goals of the Retreat were clear from the onset of the program. The mean response was 4.495 (SD=1.119). Most of the participants believed that the goals of the Retreat had been accomplished. This is probably the most important item in conjunction with the item referring to the amount of impact the Retreat would have on the participants' attitudes and behaviors. Over one-half of the participants (54.8%, N=57) believed that the goals of the Retreat had been accomplished with another 30.8% (N=32) responding "4." However, not as many believed that the Retreat would have a significant impact on their behaviors and attitudes with most responding at either a "3" (18.3%, N=19), "4" (32.7%, N=34), or "5" (19.2%, N=20) level. Another 13.5% responded at the "6" level. This indicates that the responses to this item were spread out considerably. For those responding at a lower level the impact of the Retreat may not have been as high because, as previously stated, the levels of awareness, skills, and knowledge of some participants were already quite high. The mean responses of the items concerned with whether or not the goals were accomplished and the impact of the Retreat on the participants' behaviors and attitudes

were 4.529 (SD=.909) and 4.010 (SD=1.259), respectively.

Finally, the participants were asked if they believed the Retreat had met their expectations. Most responded "5" (48.1%, N=50), with another 11.5% (N=12) responding "6," and 25.0% (N=26) responding "4" on a scale ranging from "1," "no expectations met," to "6," "all expectations met," This would seem to indicate, that for most, most expectations were met. The mean response to this item was 4.564 (SD=.963).

All in all, the Retreat seems to have been a successful venture, meeting the Retreat goals and individual expectations. For additional summary information of the Retreat, see "Conclusions and Recommendations."

Evaluation of Institute Itself

With regard to the overall rating of the Institute itself, most of the participants were "mostly satisfied" (51.5%, N=53) with about another third either "satisfied" (22.3%, N=23) or "very satisfied" (11.7%, N-12). Again, only a small percentage felt dissatisfied in some way (12.7%, N=13). The mean response to this item rating the overall Institute was 4.287 (SD=.952). I believe that these figures speak for themselves and can be interpreted to mean that the Institute and the Retreat were mostly successful as a workshop training model for educators in the reduction of sex-role stereotyping techniques and related career development concepts. Mean responses are reported in Table 15-A.

The next category of questions on the post-assessment survey was asked in order to obtain some feeling of the participants' satisfaction with the general, routine, or non-content oriented aspects of the Institute (includes the Retreat). Certain aspects of the Institute in this category were probably more important

to achieving the overall Institute goals (i.e., Developmental Growth Groups) than others. However, all of the following aspects of the Institute contribute, in part, to having a smooth running and successful workshop training experience. More than 60% of the participants (N=63) were either "mostly satisfied" or "satisfied" with the scheduling of activities. Approximately one-third of the participants responded in the "dissatisfied" range with 18.4% (N=19) "mostly dissatisfied" and 14.6% (N=15) either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the scheduling of activities. Three individuals (2.9%) were "very satisfied" with this aspect. Those responding in the "dissatisfied" range may have been reflecting the change from the plush, open, and natural Retreat setting at Northwestern College in Roseville, Minnesota, to the more academic, lecture, and classroom environment of the University of Minnesota, St. Paul Campus. The logistics of movement from one campus to another may also have been contributory. The mean response to this item was 3.690 (SD=1.089).

About three-fourths (74.8%, N=78) of the participants were satisfied with the amount of free time and breaks allotted. They were also satisfied with the amount of required homework such as the various handouts and other readings at the workshop. Only a few individuals were "dissatisfied" (12.6%, N=13) in some way with the amount of readings given out with a clear majority (81.6%, N=84) either "mostly satisfied" (40.8%, N=42), "satisfied" (29.1%, N=30) or "very satisfied" (11.7%, N=12). The mean responses to these items (on a 6-point scale) were 4.050 (SD=1.114) and 4.381 (SD=.962), respectively.

A small number of individuals (10.7%, N=11) were "very dissatisfied" with the grading and credit arrangements at the Institute and verbalized their feelings openly about this issue.

Another 11.6% (N=12) were either "dissatisfied" or "mostly dissatisfied". The basic concern of these individuals was that they neither wanted or needed the credit (see level of education described previously under "Participant Characteristics") and believed that alternative arrangements could have been made for them. Grades of "S," or "B," or audit were given for a participant's satisfactory involvement at the Institute. A grade of "A" was given if the participant provided Project BORN FREE with documentation of additional commitment to the implementation of the Project's goals at the participant's post-Institute site, or contracted for additional readings or critiquing of Institute related background materials. Three graduate credits were granted for successful completion of the Institute. The giving of grades was an administrative problem which apparently could not be resolved because of various University regulations.

It appears, however, that most of the participants (73.8%) N=76) were either "mostly satisfied", "satisfied", or "very satisfied" with the arrangements for credit and grading. In a related area, the administrative details, particularly registration and evaluation processes, more than one-half of the participants (57.3%, N=59) responded in the satisfaction range with 38.9% (N=40) indicating some feelings of dissatisfaction with both or either of these two processes. The registration process was particularly complex, but necessary in order to provide the participants with information ranging from related readings to bag lunches. In addition, the pre- and post-assessment surveys were quite lengthy and detailed, but also necessary in order to evaluate a whole week's experience and the impact on the participants. Completion of evaluation forms is probably not the most exhilarating experience in any workshop; the Institute is no exception.

Two important areas assessed by the post-assessment questionnaire asked how the participants felt about the helpfulness of the BORN FREE staff as far as structuring and feedback were concerned. Most participants seemed to be satisfied with the structuring with nearly four-fifths of the participants (79.7%, N=82) responding in a positive direction. Only 18.4% (N=19) responded in a negative direction. It is important to note that 28.2% (N=29) stated that they were "very satisfied" with the structuring. This is consistent with participant statements made during the Institute regarding the flexibility of the Institute staff in making day-to-day changes in the schedule or program in order to better meet the needs of the participants. Additionally, the participants were apparently quite satisfied with the amount and nature of the feedback from the Institute staff. Over one-third (35.6%, N=35) stated that they were "quite satisfied" with the feedback, 21.4% (N=22) "satisfied," and 27.2% (N=28) "mostly satisfied." Only 14.6% (N=15) expressed any dissatisfaction. The mean responses relative to structuring and feedback were 4.554 (SD=1.300) and 4.723 (SD=1.218), respectively.

Having an opportunity to meet and share ideas with other participants seemed to contribute to an individual's overall satisfaction during the Institute. Much of this was accomplished through a structured networking technique where the participants acted as resource people for each other, documenting specific relevant, current programs and projects at each participant's institutional or state site. Almost one-half of the participants (49.5%, N=50) responded that they were "very satisfied" with this process. Another 21.4%, (N=22) were "satisfied" with 23.3% (N=24)

"mostly satisfied." Only a very small number (3.9%, N=4) expressed any dissatisfaction with sharing or networking with other participants. The mean response to this item was 5.178 (SD=.963).

Workshop training materials, concepts, and strategies were presented in a variety of ways. For the most part this was accomplished through large group presentations, small group activities, and planning sessions, and the special videotape viewing sessions. The small group activities and planning sessions were called the Developmental Growth Groups and the Implementation Planning Groups, respectively. These were rated generally and primarily as vehicles for presentation rather than as special activities, strategies, or tapes which are reported later in this section. A majority of the participants (78.7%, N=81) were satisfied with the large group presentations; 7.8% (N=8) reported that they were "very satisfied", 31.1% (N=32) "satisfied", 39.8% "mostly satisfied." The dissatisfaction rate was 18.4% (N=19).

It appears from this section that participants had mixed feelings about several administrative aspects of the Institute. While they appeared to have positive feelings about the helpfulness of staff and the opportunity for networking with others who shared their sex equity concerns, they were extremely dissatisfied with certain aspects of the Institute, especially procedural matters such as registration, grading, and credits. They were generally satisfied with the large-group instructional mode.

Other Activities

Three videotapes were viewed by the participants during concurrent, but separate, sessions. The participants' reactions to these videotape sessions were mostly ones of satisfaction (mean response was 4.340 [SD=1.027]), Table 15-A. More than one-third (37.9%, N=39) stated that they were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the videotape sessions. Another 44.7% (N=46) were mostly satisfied with only 14.6% (N=15) falling into the dissatisfied range. Evaluation on the specific tapes is provided in a later section. Evaluation responses are based on 5-point scale.

An extremely important vehicle for demonstrating several of the BORN FREE strategies as well as providing a relationship-building function was the Developmental Growth Group. Evaluation of the specific strategies for these small groups is provided in a later section. This particular technique was very well accepted as 38.8% (N=40) were "very satisfied," 23.3% (N=24) "satisfied," and 26.2% (N=27) were either "mostly dissatisfied" or "dissatisfied" with this technique. The mean reaction to participating in the Developmental Growth Group was 4.940 (SD=1.043); the modal response was 6.0 .

The Implementation Planning Groups, where the participants were to develop a plan for implementing BORN FREE concepts at either their institution or on a state-wide basis, did not receive as strong a positive response as did the previously evaluated Developmental Growth Groups. The participants were placed into a particular Implementation Group based upon geographic distribution. In other words, people from the same state or region were likely to be in the same Implementation Group. Only 11.7% (N=12) were "very satisfied" with however another 22.3% (N=23),

"satisfied." The modal response of 4.0 (out of 5), "mostly satisfied," was responded to by 39.8% (N=41) of the participants. In the dissatisfaction range, 12.6% (N=13) were "mostly dissatisfied," 5.8% (N=6), "dissatisfied," and 3.9% (N=4), "very dissatisfied." The mean response to participation in an Implementation Group was 4.101 (SD=1.208). Closely related to participation in an Implementation Group was the preparation of implementation plans (as this was the purpose). Most participants were either "satisfied" (35.9%, N=37) or "mostly satisfied" (40.8%, N=42) with the process of developing their implementation plan and the plan itself. Only 2.9% (N=3) were "very satisfied" with 12.6% (N=13) being "mostly dissatisfied" and another 4.9% (N=5), "dissatisfied." The mean response to this item was 4.200 (SD=.888). The process of developing implementation plans might have been facilitated had, as many of the participants expressed, they known prior to the Institute that much more focus would be on developing implementation plans than previously perceived.

Writing daily logs was among those aspects of the Institute which were the least favored. Writing daily logs consisted of completing responses on a log sheet to the scheduled activities of the day, i.e. least or most favored activity. Many participants did not turn in log sheets and those who did, did not do so consistently. The mean response to this item was 3.688 (SD=1.359). Some participants, however, did express that they were quite satisfied (6.8%, N=7) with the daily log system and appreciated getting responses to the logs back from the Institute staff. Others stated that they were "satisfied" (18.4%, N=19) or "mostly satisfied" (31.1%, N=32) with the daily logs. Another one-third (34.0%, N=35) were dissatisfied

in one way or another with completing a daily log. This, in part, may have been related to negative feelings, sometimes generated in these situations, to possible over-evaluation.

The area where the most complaints were expressed by the participants was in housing arrangements. This is, no doubt, why this area received a significantly lower rating than any other aspect of the Institute. The mean response was 2.636 (SD=1.417). The modal response was 1.0 with 27.2% (N=28) of the participants stating they were "very dissatisfied" with the housing arrangements. Another 21.4% (N=22) and 20.4% (N=21) were "dissatisfied" and "mostly dissatisfied," respectively. Only slightly more than one-fourth (27.2%, N=28) expressed some degree of satisfaciton with the housing arrangements with only 3 (2.9%) people stating they were "very satisfied." The root of their complaints came about as a result of an attempt to locate adequate, but inexpensive, housing for the participants on or very near to the University of Minnesota campus. The selected housing was a men's dormitory on the Minneapolis campus. Apparently, the dorm had not been sufficiently cleaned, as there was dust in the halls as well as in the bathrooms. In addition, some participants expressed negative feelings about having to share a room with another participant even though a single room had been requested. Sadly enough, the selection in this instance was not good, but many other educational workshops have been held where dormitory housing has worked out favorably. Without elaborating further, it is sufficient to say that had the BORN FREE staff another opportunity

to present another Institute, needless to say, such dormitory accommodations would not be considered.

Forty four (42.7%) participants were dissatisfied to some degree with the transportation arrangements. About another third (33.0%, N=34) were "mostly satisfied" with 13.6% (N=14) "satisfied," and only 6.8% (N=7) "very satisfied." The mean response about transportation arrangements was 3.434 (SD=1.430). This dissatisfaction is reflected in comments that the bus arrival was much too early in the morning at the dorm and interfered to some extent with their breakfast. Participants also expressed their dissatisfaction with the major portion of the Institute being on a different campus, the St. Paul Campus, than the one where the housing was located. Arrangements were made to effectively alter the very early morning bus arrival and to provide alternative bus routes and scheduling.

Most individuals were generally satisfied with the arrangements for and the quality of the meals (lunch and dinner). The lunches were brown bag lunches provided through the dorm service. The number and quality was adequate. Participants could also use the cafeteria facility located nearby or the extensive vending machine service located in the classroom office building where many aspects of the Institute were held. A sit-down type dinner and cafeteria-style luncheon were also provided as part of the Retreat schedule where the food and service were good. Other dinners were provided as part of a per diem amount which each participant received.

Friday evening provided an opportunity for a more formal sit-down type dinner at the University of Minnesota Campus Club

in Coffman Memorial Union where presentations were made by and to the participants and the BORN FREE Institute staff. At this final dinner, awards were presented and the Project Director expressed her appreciation to all concerned and stressed the impact of the BORN FREE concepts and goals at the national level.

The mean response to the above meals was 4.090 (SD=1.181) with 43.7% (N=45) "mostly satisfied" and 25.2% (N=26) "satisfied." About one-fifth (19.4%, N=20) expressed some degree of dissatisfaction and 8.7% (N=9) indicated that they were "very satisfied."

Finally, in a rating of the overall Institute including the Retreat, the mean response was 4.591 (SD=.981). Most participants (82.5%, N=85) rated the overall Institute in the satisfaction range with 33.0% (N=34) "mostly satisfied," 34.0% (N=35) "satisfied," and 15.5% (N=16) "very satisfied." Only 7.8% (N=8) individuals expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with 1.9% (N=2) "dissatisfied" and 4.9% (N=5) "mostly dissatisfied." One (1.0%) individual stated that he/she was "very dissatisfied" with the overall Institute. It is difficult to imagine that this one individual was not affected by the Institute in some form or fashion. It is of special interest that two of these dissatisfied individuals were among the first to make follow-up summer contacts with the Project office seeking further materials and tapes for use in BORN FREE workshops they were presenting.

Ratings of Specific Activities Within the Institute

In order to obtain a somewhat more detailed look at what made the Institute an apparent success, it is necessary to evaluate how the participants rated the actual activities. The following evaluation is organized into five parts: presentations, videotapes, developmental growth groups, implementation planning and presentation, and resource panels and groups. See Table 16-A.

Presentations

There were three major presentations at the Institute. The Project Director presented "Systems Approach to Program Development." The mean response to her presentation was 3.804 (SD=1.092). This presentation was, as were all the presentations and other activities, rated on a scale from "1" to "5", where a code of "1" indicated that the activity was "not at all useful"; "2", "slightly useful"; "3", "moderately useful"; "4", "quite useful"; and "5", "very useful." Thirty (29.1%) individuals found this presentation "very useful," 28.2% (N=29), "quite useful," and 19.4% (N=20) "moderately useful." Only 10.7% (N=11) stated that the presentation was "slightly useful" with two (1.9%) believing that it was "not at all useful." More than three-fourths of the participants found this presentation to be useful to them to some degree. Some (6.8%, N=7) participants stated that this presentation did not apply to them. This could be the result of having missed this particular presentation.

The second presentation was "Resistance to Change" dealing with change process theory particularly in organizations. This was presented by an Associate Professor, Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology, from the University of Minnesota. The mean participant response was 2.546 (SD=1.118), and was generally rated lower than the other presentations. Many participants ex-

pressed that the time allowed for such a presentation was not sufficient. Others believed, apparently because of the high overall level of expertise, that some of the information was rather basic. Some participants stated that the method of presenting was probably not the best, but also realized that the imposed time regulations made an alternate method of presenting improbable. The ratings were as follows: "very useful", 3.9% (N=4), "quite useful", 15.5% (N=16), "moderately useful", 28.2% (N=29), "slightly useful", 27.2% (N=28), and 19.4% (N=20), stated that the presentation was "not at all useful."

The third major presentation was "Racism/Sexism in Career Options" by an invited resource person. This particular presentation was rated fairly high with a mean response of 4.186 (SD=1.115). The presentation was primarily verbal with an extensive use of visuals and props. Many participants commented that the presentation was a dynamic and unique way of relating the concepts involved in sexism with those of racism. More than half (53.4%,N=55) thought the presentation was "very useful" with another quarter (25.2%, N=26) believing that it was "quite useful." Only about one-fifth (20.4%, N=21) rated this activity at or lower than "moderately useful."

Videotapes

Seven videotapes were shown during planned Institute sessions. These and others were viewed at the dorm on some evenings, but were not evaluated for this report. Specific videotape evaluations are included in Technical Report No.4 and 9 on workshops, videotapes, and learning strategies. However, if any relative comparison can be made between the various activities completed

at the Institute, the videotapes seemed to be a clear winner. The videotape "Women: Choices and Changes" received a mean response rating of 3.908 (SD=.980); "Parenting - Three Generations," 3.980 (SD=.860); "Parents as Influencers," 3.961 (SD=.128); "Men: Choices and Changes," 3.489 (SD=1.061); "Why Change?", 4.045 (SD=.983); "Schools as Influencers", 4.190 (SD=.783); and "College as Influencers," 4.117 (SD=.922). See Table 16-A.

With the exception of "Men: Choices and Changes," which was presented to the entire Institute group at the same time, the tapes were viewed in separate sessions with about one-third of the group going to a given tape session. In other words, three different tapes were being run simultaneously with one-third of the Institute group scheduled to view each tape.

The higher N's in Table 1-A are probably the result of having the tapes available for the participants to preview at their leisure in the dorm area. Of those who viewed the videotapes, between 69.2% and 81.1% of the participants believed that the tapes were either "quite useful" or "very useful." The significance of this is evident in that a major portion of the Project BORN FREE activities and goal orientation has been in the production of these videotape programs as an instructional vehicle to reduce sex-role stereotyping relative to career development.

Developmental Growth Groups

Two Developmental Growth Groups (D.G.G.) were scheduled for the Institute in addition to those at the retreat (see Retreat Evaluation). The purpose of the D.D.G. has been described in the previous section (Major Aspects of the Institute). The two learning strategies demonstrated in the D.D.G.'s were "Career Family Tree"

and "Joe Househusband." The "Career Family Tree" strategy had a mean response of 3.616 (SD=1.229) while the "Joe Househusband" strategy had a mean response of 3.457 (SD=1.242). About one-fourth (26.7%, N=23) stated they found the "Career Family Tree" strategy "very useful" with another 36.0% (N=31) believing it to be "quite useful." Another 17.4% (N=15) thought it was "moderately useful." About one-fifth (19.7%, N=17) found it to be only "slightly useful" or "not useful at all."

Althought the D.G.G.'s met to experience the "Joe Househusband" strategy, only 46 (44.8%) participants actually did the exercise, as these groups were given the option to take on a maintenance function and take care of various participant problems and feelings. Of those completing the actual exercise, 26.1% (N=12) found it to be "very useful," 21.7% (N=10), "quite useful," 32.6% (N=15) believed it would be "moderately useful" to them, 10.9% (N=5) said it was only "slightly useful," and four (8.7%) participants thought it was "not at all useful,"

Implementation Planning and Presentation

Three sessions were scheduled where the Implementation Planning Groups met to derive either a statewide, regional, or institutional plan for implementing BORN FREE concepts and goals. The mean responses of sessions I, II, and III were 3.139 (SD=.970), 3.433 (SD=1.040), and 3.521(SD=1.251), respectively. Many individuals desired to organize a plan strictly for their own institutions; hence, the term Personal Implementation Plan (P.I.P.) was coined during the Institute. In comparison with some of the other acitvities, the P.I.P. groups were rated somewhat lower. Many participants stated that they had come to the Institute not

fully aware of the amount of time which would be allocated for implementation planning or that they would have to develop a rather complete plan by the end of the Institute. Others believed that they had not had sufficient time to read and select from the tremendous quantities of material published by Project BORN FREE and disseminated prior to and during the Institute.

However, generally more than two-thirds of the participants found these sessions to be either "very useful," "quite useful," or "moderately useful." Only about one-fifth stated the implementation sessions were either "slightly useful" or "not at all useful." The remaining participants rated these activities as being "not applicable." A possible reason for those rating this activity below "moderately useful" or "not applicable" could be the result of increased frustration to complete an implementation plan in a limited time period. The Institute staff did, however, make some adjustments to the original schedule and expected outcomes by allowing the participants the option of submitting a detailed outline of a plan rather than a complete plan. In addition, others were allowed to send their plan to the BORN FREE staff shortly after they returned home.

On the last day of the Institute, the participants had an opportunity to share their plan with other participants at their institutional level; elementary, secondary, or postsecondary. The mean participant response to this sharing session was 3.409 (SD=1.297). Only 69 individuals participated in the sharing of implementation plans in the smaller groups. Only another 22 individuals rated the item regarding the presentation of implementation plans (mean response = 3.471, SD=.244). A possible explanation for this is that only those who actually presented a

portion of their plan to the large group rated this item as 64 individuals stated that this did not apply to them.

Nevertheless, nearly all implementation plans were received either at the Institute or mailed to the Project BORN FREE office after the Institute. Hopefully, as future correspondence is received though continued follow-up, the initial implementation plan would have planted the seed for some major institutional or state-level changes.

Resource Panels and Groups

In addition to the other activities, the participants met in three other specialized groups set up primarily for sharing of ideas and meeting with the Institute staff people who were originally involved in the writing of the literature reviews and development of other materials. The participant ratings for these sessions were as follows: Elementary Resource Panel (mean response= 3.310, SD=1.158), Secondary Resource Panel (mean response=3.583, SD=1.097). Postsecondary Resource Panel (mean response=3.797, SD=1.091), discussion of the literature reviews (mean response= 3.407, SD=1.073), and the Brown Bag Discussion: Using Training Materials group (obviously a luncheon group), (mean response=4.014, SD=1.000). Of these, the Brown Bag Discussion Group seemed to be a particularly useful technique with 72.2% (N=52) of the participants involved in this discussion finding it either "very useful" or "quite useful."

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Statistical analysis is an important part of any evaluation of this nature, but the actual written comments by the participants provide a broader view of the participants' perception of the Institute and the impact it had on them. Tables 17-A through 20-A

include selected responses of the participants. Many of these responses were selected because they were thought to be either representative of the participants generally or because an individual made a particularly discerning comment. Other comments were selected entirely at random screening for duplication so that each question had four response examples.

The questions were designed to elicit comments regarding participant changes in awareness, knowledge, skills, attitudes/values, and behaviors. In addition, they were asked questions regarding what each had gained from participating in the Institute, the most satisfying aspects or activities, and questions regarding their conclusions and recommendations.

Since the related questions and participant responses are included in the Appendix, Tables 17-A to 20-A as previously stated, there is no need to squander space by duplicating them here. However, some responses by participants seem to reflect what appeared to be the general feeling of most participants, as these comments relate directly to achieving some Institute objectives. They are as follows:

> "I have become acquainted with literature and training techniques which will be useful in designing workshops (awareness) for staff personnel on all levels."
>
> "Stronger commitment to helping my own children find options. Help parents, especially of girls, to realize critical nature of freer futures for girls. Continued commitment to all women for open options."
>
> "The Institute gave me what I needed, which was to increase my awareness of sex-role stereotyping."
>
> "More knowledgeable regarding career development principles and strategies for intervention."

Post-Institute Correspondence

Although not a part of the original planned evaluative process, the many letters received from the Institute participants provide a more personal, non-statistical evaluation. Included in Appendix C are four representative letters which serve to demonstrate the personal impact of the Institute on the participants, as well as to document certain activities carried out by these individuals upon returning home. More than 25 such letters have been received to date.

It is evident from reading this correspondence that the Institute was a worthwhile venture affecting the participants' lives and the educational processes promoted by these individuals.

V. Conclusions and Recommendation

Conclusions

This section will focus on the effectiveness of the BORN FREE National Summer Institute, 1978, as perceived in terms of the initial stated purposes and Institute objectives.

Institute Effectiveness. The analyses of the data from pre- to post-Institute assessment would seem to indicate fairly strongly that positive changes had occurred in most areas as set forth in Institute objectives. As a result of the Institute, the participants were more aware in all assessed areas with the possible exception of their own career development. They were more knowledgeable in all the assessed areas including career development concepts and applications. The greatest gain in knowledge had been made in learning about techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes. Their skill levels had increased in all assessed areas, particularly in having and using new resources for implementing an intervention plan at their institution or on a state-wide basis. In addition, great gains had been made in the reported skill level of the participant to be able to train other educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. The Institute objective of increasing the repertoire of skills and materials in workshop design and training had apparently been met.

In regard to any change which occurred in attitudes/values, it is apparent that little, if any, changes have been made.

The obvious reason for this phenomenon is related to participant selection. The selection process actively sought those participants who were already committed to BORN FREE goals (e.g., to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping) and those who had previous experiences of one kind or another in the areas of career development, reduction of sex-role stereotyping, affirmative action, and so on. The Institute seemed to increase commitment and provide support for institutional change.

One of the purposes of the Institute was to provide the participants with training materials and a training workshop design. This was provided to each participant in the form of the three training packets (Career Development Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Educational Institutions) at each leve. (Elementary, Secondary, Higher Education/ Postsecondary). In addition, videotapes were provided each state to supplement the Training Packets. Although the evaluation of these training modules and videotapes is the subject matter of several other Project evaluation reports, the analyses indicate that these made a significant contribution to the participants' belief that they would be able to implement intervention plans in their state or institution.

Although it is difficult to really measure the Institute's effectiveness over the short time period that it took place for the previously stated reasons related to experimental design, some of the representative letters indicate that the future for implementation programs designed by the Institute participants

seems very encouraging.

Workshop Activities. Many of the activities were selected from the more than 200 available from the Project's Training Packets. Others, as previously noted, were presentations, panel discussions, implementation planning groups, and so on. Many of the training packet activities and strategies were selected for use at the Institute because of their proven acceptance and effectiveness through previous evaluations or were selected because they were believed to be highly appropriate for the Institute. Overall, most participants found the various activities to be from moderately to quite useful. Certain activities seemed to be rated generally higher than others, such as the videotapes and informal discussion and sharing with other participants. Particularly noteworthy was the networking activity. This must have been a particularly appropriate and necessary function with this group of national participants. This activity was rated as more satisfying than any other. Participants felt that they now had a data base of support, exemplary, and demonstration programs to use as a national resource for carrying out their personal implementation interventions. Most participants were also quite satisfied with the Developmental Growth Groups as a vehicle for demonstrating various strategies as well as the apparent maintenance function role which these groups took on.

The least satisfying activities seemed to be the presentation on "Resistance to Change" and the "Introduction to Implementation Plans" (session 1) group. These low ratings may have been a

function of (1) the short amount of time allocated to these activities where more seemed to be warranted, (2) the high level of participant knowledge and skill, and (3) the lack of specific guidelines or inservice training on the part of the staff as a whole to provide structured implementation strategy guidelines.

In general, the participants' assessments of the activities were favorable. The Retreat and individual activities at the Retreat were rated much higher than the four-day Institute as far as an overall evaluation is concerned.

General. Although the Retreat/Institute as a whole was a mostly satisfying, rewarding, and useful experience, the participants were not particularly satisfied with either the housing or the transportation arrangements. While these areas are only incidental to the content and impact of the Retreat/Institute, they may have served to somewhat reduce the overall ratings of the Retreat/Institute.

Recommendations

Although the major aspects of the Retreat/Institute as well as the specific activities generally received positive ratings, certain recommendations regarding future applications should be made. The following recommendations are not presented for planning any future Project BORN FREE National Institute, as the Project has essentially completed its goals, but may be useful in planning workshops at a local, state, or even regional level.

Participant Characteristics. These participants came to the Institute with extensive, significant experiences, particularly leadership experiences in staff development/inservice programs, educational improvement programs, career development/career education programs, and affirmative action/sex discrimination programs. They were not novices by any definition of the word. They were, for the most part, national representatives in their respective areas. They were extremely well educated and sophisticated. This highly qualified group of individuals may tend to be more critical of certain aspects of the Institute or the Institute as a whole. This may be particularly true in exercises or presentations where an individual participant's knowledge or experience may be quite high, possibly even at an expert level.

Even though the overall estimates of the Retreat and the Institute proper were favorable, the interaction of the stated participant characteristic variables may have reduced the overall ratings in comparison with a lesser experienced participant group. Subgroup diversity might be an important issue to consider in the design of future workshops of this nature.

One final recommendation in regard to the participants relates to the awarding of credits, audits, and grades for Institute attendance. Although the number of participants quite concerned about this process was relatively small, they were quite vocal. Perhaps in future workshops where participants are eligible to receive credits, audits, and/or grades, these matters should be made more explicit in pre-workshop information.

Comparisons with the 1977 Local Institute

A few words need to be said about how the 1978 National Institute compared with the 1977 Local Summer Institute. While a detailed comparison is beyond the scope of this report, it should be useful for BORN FREE trainers to examine the evaluation of that workshop (Keierleber, 1977) and the Follow-up Study (Warsett, 1978). The Local Institute was two weeks long.

It is significant that the composition of the local training group was quite different from the national group. The local participants had had much less experience and training in the focus areas of the Project. They also rated their overall workshop much more positively (6.44 on a 7.0 scale). In many ways they comprised a much more homogeneous group in their needs than the national participants. They also reported experiencing more personal growth through their BORN FREE experience. This may be related to their having had fewer prior experiences in working on problems of career-related sex-role stereotyping. Some of the learning activities appeared to be much more satisfying to the local group though they too experienced frustration with their implementation plans. Perhaps it was that they were more motivated to change personally than to try to change others through becoming trainers. (They most valued the Developmental Growth Group experiences.)

While there were both high points and low points in both Institutes, the National Institute did not appear to produce the glowing evaluations of the earlier workshop. The difference in ratings of overall effectiveness clearly reflects this. Although both experiences were definitely ranked on the positive side, it is important for workshop planners to assess the reasons for the differences. Some interpretations have already been advanced, but readers are invited to examine the two evaluation reports cited to form their own judgments about

differences in the effectiveness of the two major BORN FREE Institutes.

Some Final Recommendations

In the planning of future workshops, particularly at the local or state level, it seems that certain ideas should be noted, e.g., a two-week Institute is more effective than one week.

The Developmental Growth Group appears to be an effective vehicle for either demonstrating proven strategies selected from the Project modules for training purposes or for self-awareness and personal development. In addition, in workshops of any length they also provide the necessary core for relationship building and the handling of various maintenance functions.

If the "product" of a workshop is to develop an implementation plan, this should be understood by all the participants at or prior to the onset. Implementation objectives should be detailed and articulated early on in a given workshop. Trainers or facilitators of implementation groups should be competent in the knowledge and presentation of implementation/intervention strategies. Finally, participants should only have to identify with one functional small group throughout the workshop (e.g., Developmental Growth Group) where the group function, not the participant, changes.

The videotapes, excellent resources as evaluated, should be used in any future BORN FREE workshops vís-a-vís the modules and depending upon group or participant characteristics. Videotape presentations should probably only be done with classroom (or

smaller) size groups unless, of course, an adequate number of monitors is available.

Sufficient time should be allocated for each activity. Presentations seem to suffer tremendously where limited time is a factor. As may have been apparent in this report, some activities were dropped from the schedule during the Institute due to time limitations. These activities may or may not have made significant contributions to the overall Institute.

Evaluation needs. The evaluation of the 1978 BORN FREE National Summer Institute consisted primarily of a pre-assessment/post-assessment design with supplementary evaluations of the Institute's major aspects and specific activities introduced during the Institute. Open-ended responses and follow-up correspondence provided additional evidence for support of the objective item results. Although this pretest/posttest design was essentially satisfactory for this purpose, a more elaborate design where an experimental control is used for comparative purposes might lead to more conclusive statements about the results of the Institute.

Additional validation of the learning strategies is needed in order to determine which strategies work best with which subgroups with certain participant characteristics. Related to the validation of the strategies is the selection of trainers to use them. Perhaps additional analysis of variance could be done in order to determine what kinds of people with which particular leadership experiences (e.g., career development, affirmative

action, etc.) this type of Institute design is more appropriate for. One might look not only at the main effects, but also at the N-way interactions of several types of leadership experiences.

A researcher involved in the planning of future workshops might find it useful to obtain data from this Institute and other planned state or regional level workshops. A small number of relevant variables could be selected from this development group (with a large national data base) to be used with certain multivariate procedures (e.g., configural prediction techniques) to explore the possibility that certain types of people make better trainers or are more amenable to change process in this area (reduction of sex-role stereotyping in career development).

Standardized instrumentation such as sex-role attitude surveys or knowledge tests might be administered to measure changes in actual attitudes or skill/knowledge levels. This might be used for normative comparisons with other groups.

Summary

The 1978 BORN FREE National Summer Institute, even with some of the previously stated limitations, was a successful staff development training model to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. Significant increases occurred in almost all areas of awareness, knowledge, skills, and attitudes/values with a group comprised of diverse participant characteristics and levels of expertise. The participants were provided with a training model and extensive training materials, including learning

modules and videotapes, to use as resources in the development of their own personal implementation plans. The Institute participants using this model and these materials should be able to return to their institutions or states and provide workshops designed to expand the range of career options for women and men, by reducing career-related sex-role stereotyping.

References

Fernandes, Kathleen. Project BORN FREE case study: The first year's findings. Women's Educational Equity Act Program, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., March 1978.

Havelock, R.G. The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology, 1973.

Keierleber, D.L. Evaluation of the 1977 BORN FREE summer institute: A workshop model to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping. Technical Report No. 5, Project BORN FREE, College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1977.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. Statistical package for the social sciences. Hightstown, NJ: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Warsett, S. Evaluation Report on BORN FREE Videotapes, Training Packets and Selected Workshops. Technical Report No. 9, October, 1978.

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Tables 1-A to 20-A
Appendix B	Retreat and Institute Schedules
Appendix C	Post-Institute Correspondence
Appendix D	D-1 Pre-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants
	D-2 Post-Assessment Survey of BORN FREE Institute Participants
	D-3 Project BORN FREE Retreat Evaluation Form
Appendix E	Listing of BORN FREE Products and Publications
Appendix F	Components of Project BORN FREE Evaluation in Second Year
Appendix G	Project Abstract

Appendix A

TABLE 1-A

Project BORN FREE
Retreat Evaluation Form

Item	N*	$\bar{X}$	SD
Retreat			
1. The retreat site was appealing, attractive, and well located. I felt comfortable in these surroundings.	104	5.615	.828
2. The retreat was well organized (i.e., agenda, activities, presentations, time, breaks, etc.)	102	4.588	1.008
3. The goals of the retreat were very clear.	103	4.495	1.119
4. In my opinion, the overall goals of the retreat were accomplished.	102	4.529	.909
5. In general, I felt that the retreat climate was open, trusting, and that information flowed freely among the participants.	103	5.330	.821
6. I felt that when I had a contribution to make, I had an opportunity to make it.	104	5.538	.696
7. I felt that the content and activities were interesting.	102	4.931	1.037
8. The presenters were knowledgeable and competent.	101	5.119	.909
Rating of Activities			
1. Career Mixer	100	4.520	1.114
2. BORN FREE Institute overview	101	4.891	.915
3. Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development	101	4.634	.946
4. Career Development Framework	100	4.810	.907
5. Career Life Line	102	4.686	1.108

TABLE 1-A (continued)

Project BORN FREE
Retreat Evaluation Form

Item	N*	$\bar{X}$	SD
Rating of Activities (continued)			
6. Videotape: "World of Options"	103	4.757	.955
7. Resource Networking of Problems and Solutions	103	4.563	1.250
8. Magic Seminar	96	4.677	1.081
Ranking of Activities			
1. Career Mixer	90	5.500	2.163
2. BORN FREE Institute overview	94	3.426	2.148
3. Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development	95	4.021	1.989
4. Career Development Framework	93	4.323	1.995
5. Career Life Line	94	4.670	2.097
6. Videotape: "World of Options"	94	4.011	2.117
7. Resource Networking of Problems and Solutions	97	4.557	2.406
8. Magic Seminar	89	5.191	2.374
9. Masculine/Feminine	15	4.800	2.624
The retreat met my expectations.	101	4.564	.963
This retreat will probably have a significant impact on my attitudes or behaviors.	100	4.010	1.259

*Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants to questions.

TABLE 2-A

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants
Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Institutional Background Information			
1. In the past my institution has actively and successfully sponsored programs concerned with problems of career development.	96	2.813	.825
2. Currently, the staff morale at my institution is quite good.	94	2.521	.714
3. Most of the male students in my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex-role stereotypes can limit their own career development.	85	1.741	.710
4. The current economic situation of my institution would significantly limit the number of activities that could be employed to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices.	93	2.473	.842
5. Most of the female staff within my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex-role stereotypes can limit their own career development.	96	2.677	.814
6. Most of the staff within my institution are very concerned about how their sex-role stereotyping attitudes and practices may limit the career options of students.	93	2.000	.752
7. The current time demands upon the staff in my institution would significantly limit the amount of cooperation or help the staff could give to help reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping attitudes or practices within my institution.	96	2.667	.691
8. There are many practices in my institutions that encourage sex-role stereotyping for male students.	90	3.067	.761
9. Generally, my institution's policies and practices are very responsive and open to change; thus, I expect that a number of changes easily could be made in my institution to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices without having to make substantial and disruptive changes in the system.	96	2.375	.785

TABLE 2-A (continued)

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

	Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
10.	Most of the male staff within my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex-role stereotyping can limit their own career development.	96	1.917	.749
11.	Presently, there is considerable tension between male and female staff in my institution concerning sex bias and discrimination issues.	91	2.220	.772
12.	In the past, my institution has actively and successfully sponsored programs concerned with problems of sex bias and discrimination.	95	2.305	.888
13.	There are many practices in my institution that encourage sex-role stereotypes for female students.	92	2.880	.724
14.	My institution is neither presently facing or will be facing an immediate crisis that will overshadow all other issues or concerns such as career-related sex-role stereotyping.	93	2.462	.916
15.	Most of the female students in my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex-role stereotypes can limit their own career development.	86	2.302	.827
16.	My institution's administration will openly and actively support efforts to reduce sex-role stereotyping attitudes and practices that may limit the career development of students.	95	2.979	.729
	State Background Information			
1.	Within my state, the legislature has given very little priority, if any, to redressing sex inequalities and sex discrimination practices in general.	94	2.798	.850

TABLE 2-A (continued)

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

	Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
2.	Compared to what other states spend on public education, my state spends at least as much as, if not more than, what most other states spend.	86	2.570	1.046
3.	The issue of career education is one given top priority throughout my state with substantial state funds allocated or available for developing or improving career education/career development programs.	95	2.474	.885
4.	My state has a comprehensive "career education" plan in which the influence of sex-role stereotyping in one's career development is recognized and addressed.	90	2.511	.864
5.	Throughout my state, most, if not all, educational institutions at my level either currently are or will be shortly facing dramatic enrollment declines which are, in turn, having significant negative side effects.	86	2.814	.901
6.	In general, most of my state's educational institutions at my level are very supportive of Title IX (Affirmative Action) both in the letter and the spirit of the law.	86	2.581	.833
7.	The top education officials in my state will be willing to support (fund) extensive inservice training of state educators to reduce sex-role stereotyping practices in state educational institutions.	103	2.816	1.454

*Responses are coded as follows: 1="completely disagree"; 2= "mostly disagree"; 3="mostly agree"; 4="completely agree".

TABLE 3-A

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants
Descriptive Statistics*

Item	X	SD
Your Present Awareness		
1. My own career development	4.146	.821
2. My own sex role socialization	4.146	.868
3. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on career development	3.951	1.004
4. My attitudes concerning sex differences, traditional sex roles vs. androgyny	3.796	1.132
5. My own sex-role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work	3.816	.926
6. Sex-role stereotyping practices at my institution that limit career options of students	3.466	1.170
7. Practices at my institution that broaden career options of students	3.427	1.193
8. Resources available in my institution that can be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices	3.330	1.014
9. Barriers within my institution that will inhibit my efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices	3.398	1.013
10. Resources available in my state that can be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	2.777	1.084
11. Barriers within my state that will inhibit efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	2.699	1.128

*Number of respondents = 103; responses are coded as follows: 1= "not at all aware"; 2= "slightly aware"; 3= "moderately aware"; 4= "quite aware"; 5= "extremely aware."

TABLE 4-A

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
Your Present Knowledge		
1. Career development concepts and applications	3.330	1.052
2. Sex-role socialization process	3.524	.906
3. Influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career	3.738	.828
4. Androgyny and sex-role transcendence	3.097	1.089
5. Techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes	2.786	1.016
6. Principles of change process	3.204	.933
7. Principles of program development	3.252	.977

* Number of respondents = 103; responses are coded as follows: 1= "not at all knowledgeable"; 2= "slightly knowledgeable"; 3= "moderately knowledgeable"; 4= "Quite knowledgeable"; 5= "extremely knowledgeable."

TABLE 5-A

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	$\bar{X}$	SD
Yours Present Skills		
1. Continuous self-analysis regarding my own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors	3.495	.873
2. Recognizing and challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals	3.330	.974
3. Conducting a system diagnosis of my institution and state needs	2.136	1.085
4. Locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan	2.631	1.102
5. Motivating educators to reduce their sex-role stereotyping practices	2.524	.948
6. Training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions	2.379	1.197

*Number of respondents = 103; responses are coded as follows: 1= "not at all skillful"; 2= "slightly skillful"; 3= "moderately skillful"; 4= "quite skillful"; 5= "extremely skillful."

TABLE 6-A

Pre-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Present Attitudes/Values			
1. The issue of sex-role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females.	102	3.814	.502
2. The concept of career should include both work and family.	102	3.902	.386
3. The issue of career development and sex-role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in my state.	102	3.853	.431
4. I am committed to continually monitoring my own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors.	101	3.752	.573
5. I am very committed to challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of others.	102	3.412	.619
6. I am confident that I will be able to make needed changes in my institution and state that will result in expanded career options for all students.	98	3.061	.701

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "completely disagree"; 2= "mostly disagree"; 3= "mostly agree"; 4= "completely agree."

**Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants of pre-assessment.

TABLE 7-A

BORN FREE National Institute

Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments*

Present Awareness

			Assessment				
			Pre		Post		
	Item	N*	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value	p-value
1.	My own career development	103	4.1456	.821	4.3107	.767	-1.87	.065
2.	My own sex-role socialization	103	4.1456	.868	4.3689	.714	-2.74	.007
3.	The influence of sex-role stereotypes on my career development	103	3.9515	1.004	4.2621	.816	-2.84	.006
4.	My attitudes concerning sex differences, traditional sex roles vs. androgyny	103	3.7961	1.132	4.4272	.695	-5.32	.000
5.	My own sex-role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work	103	3.8155	.926	4.2621	.766	-4.30	.000
6.	Sex-role stereotyping practices at my institution that limit career options of students	102	3.4706	1.175	3.7941	.905	-2.99	.003
7.	Practices at my institution that broaden career options of students	102	3.4314	1.198	3.7647	.925	-3.01	.003
8.	Resources available in my institution that can be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices	103	3.3301	1.014	3.6117	.931	-2.67	.009
9.	Barriers witnin my institution that will inhibit my efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices	103	3.3981	1.013	3.8641	.875	-4.79	.000

* Responses are coded as follows: 1= "completely disagree"; 2= "mostly disagree"; 3= "mostly agree"; 4= "completely agree."

TABLE 7-A (Continued)

Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post- Workshop Assessments

Present Awareness

	Item	N*	Assessment: Pre $\bar{X}$	Pre SD	Post $\bar{X}$	Post SD	t-value	p-value
10.	Resources available in my state that can be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	103	2.7767	1.084	3.3689	1.066	-5.39	.000
11.	Barriers within my state that will inhibit efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	101	2.7030	1.136	3.2475	1.024	-4.78	.000

*Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants to questions.

TABLE 8-A

BORN FREE National Institute
Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments

Present Knowledge

			Assessment					
			Pre		Post			
	Item	N*	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value	p-value
1.	Career development concepts and applications	101	3.3267	1.059	3.8713	.821	-5.93	.000
2.	Sex-role socialization process	101	3.5248	.912	4.0990	.781	-6.27	.000
3.	Influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development	101	3.7327	.835	4.3069	.674	-6.86	.000
4.	Androgyny and sex-role transcendence	100	3.0800	1.098	3.8900	.803	-7.57	.000
5.	Techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes	101	2.7723	1.019	3.9703	.768	-11.58	.000
6.	Principles of change process	101	3.1980	.938	3.8614	.693	-6.46	.000
7.	Principles of program development	101	3.2475	.984	4.0495	.726	-7.90	.000

*Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants to questions.

11

TABLE 9-A
BORN FREE National Institute
Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments

Present Skills

			Assessment					
			Pre		Post			
	Item	N*	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value	p-value
1.	Continuous self analysis regarding my own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors	101	3.4950	.879	4.1089	.662	-7.97	.000
2.	Recognizing and challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals	100	3.3100	.982	3.8400	.762	-5.30	.000
3.	Conducting a system diagnosis of my institution and state needs	100	2.1400	1.073	3.2700	.920	-9.59	.000
4.	Locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan	101	2.6139	1.104	3.7624	.777	-10.33	.000
5.	Motivating educators to reduce their sex-role stereotyping practices	101	2.5050	.945	3.4752	.729	-9.02	.000
6.	Training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex-role stereotyping in their institutions	98	2.3776	1.162	3.4490	.943	-9.29	.000

*Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants to questions.

TABLE 10-A
BORN FREE National Institute
Comparison of Participants' Perceptions Concerning
Career Development, Sex-Role Stereotyping, and Institutional Change
at Pre- and Post-Workshop Assessments

Present Attitudes/Values

			Assessment				
			Pre		Post		
	Item	N*	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t-value	p-value
1.	The issue of sex-role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females	102	3.8137	.502	3.8333	.615	-.27	.787
2.	The concept of career should include both work and family	102	3.9020	.386	3.8725	.557	.46	.650
3.	The issue of career development and sex-role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in my state	101	3.8614	.425	3.8713	.542	-.15	.885
4.	I am committed to continually monitoring my own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors	101	3.7525	.573	3.8416	.561	-1.14	.259
5.	I am very committed to challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of others	100	3.4200	.522	3.6200	.678	-2.41	.018
6.	I am confident that I will be able to make needed changes in my institution and state that will result in expanded career options for all students	97	3.0619	.704	3.2990	.738	-2.83	.006

*Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants to questions.

TABLE 11-A

Post-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Your Present Awareness			
1. My own career development	103	4.311	.767
2. My own sex-role socialization	103	4.369	.714
3. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on my career development	103	4.262	.816
4. My attitudes concerning sex differences, traditional sex roles vs. androgyny	103	4.427	.695
5. My own sex-role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work	103	4.262	.766
6. Sex-role stereotyping practices at my institution that limit career options of students	102	3.794	.905
7. Practices at my institution that broaden career options of students	102	3.765	.925
8. Resources available in my institution that can be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices	103	3.612	.931
9. Barriers within my institution that will inhibit my efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices	103	3.864	.875
10. Resources available in my state that can be used in reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	103	3.369	1.066
11. Barriers within my state that will inhibit efforts related to reducing sex-role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	101	3.248	1.024

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "not at all aware"; 2= "slightly aware"; 3= "moderately aware"; 4= "quite aware"; 5= "Extremely aware."

TABLE 12-A

Post-Assessment Survey of

BORN FREE

National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\overline{X}$	SD
Your Present Knowledge			
1. Career development through concepts and applications	101	3.871	.821
2. Sex-role socialization process	101	4.099	.781
3. Influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development	101	4.307	.674
4. Androgyny and sex-role transcendence	100	3.890	.803
5. Techniques for eliminating sex-role stereotypes	101	3.970	.768
6. Principles of change process	101	3.861	.693
7. Principles of program development	101	4.050	.726

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "not at all knowledgeable"; 2= "slightly knowledgeable"; 3= "moderately knowledgeable"; 4= "quite knowledgeable"; 5= "extremely knowledgeable."

TABLE 13-A

Post-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Your Present Skills			
1. Continuous self-analysis regarding my own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors	101	4.109	.662
2. Recognizing and challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of other individuals	100	3.840	.762
3. Conducting a system diagnosis of my institution and state needs	100	3.270	.920
4. Locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan	101	3.762	.777
5. Motivating educators to reduce their sex-role stereotyping practices	101	3.475	.729
6. Training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-oriented sex-role stereotyping in their institutions	98	3.449	.943

*Responses are coded as follows: 1="not at all skillful"; 2= "slightly skillful"; 3= "moderately skillful"; 4= "quite skillful"; 5= "extremely skillful."

TABLE 14-A

Post-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Your Present Attitudes/Values			
1. The issue of sex-role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females.	103	3.835	.612
2. The concept of career should include both work and family.	103	3.874	.554
3. The issue of career development and sex-role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in my state.	102	3.873	.539
4. I am committed to continually monitoring my own sex-role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors.	103	3.845	.556
5. I am very committed to challenging sex-role stereotyping practices of others.	101	3.624	.676
6. I am confident that I will be able to make needed changes in my institution and state that will result in expanded career options for all students.	101	3.287	.753

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "completely disagree"; 2= "mostly disagree"; 3= "mostly agree"; 4+ "completely agree."

TABLE 15-A

Post-Assessment Survey of

BORN FREE

National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Ratings of Major Aspects of the Institute			
1. Retreat (Tuesday)	101	4.515	1.128
2. Institute (Wednesday to Saturday)	101	4.287	.952
3. Scheduling of Activities	100	3.690	1.089
4. Amount of Free Time and Breaks	100	4.050	1.114
5. Amount of Required Homework (Readings, Planning)	97	4.381	.962
6. Grading/Credit Arrangement	99	4.131	1.489
7. Administrative Details (Regis., Eval.)	99	3.687	1.353
8. Helpfulness of BORN FREE Staff: Structuring	101	4.554	1.300
9. Helpfulness of BORN FREE Staff: Feedback	101	4.723	1.218
10. Sharing/Networking with Other Participants	101	5.178	.963
11. Large Group Presentations	100	4.200	1.064
12. Videotape Viewing Sessions	100	4.340	1.027
13. Developmental Growth Groups	100	4.940	1.043
14. Implementation Planning Groups	99	4.101	1.208
15. Writing Daily Logs	93	3.688	1.359

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "very dissatisfied"; 2= "dissatisfied"; 3= "mostly dissatisfied"; 4= "mostly satisfied"; 5= "satisfied"; 6= "very satisfied."

TABLE 15-A (continued)

Post-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
16. Preparation of Implementation Plans	100	4.200	.888
17. Housing Arrangements	99	2.636	1.417
18. Transportation Arrangements	99	3.434	1.430
19. Meals (lunch and dinner)	100	4.090	1.181
20. Overall Institute, including Retreat	93	4.591	.981

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "very dissatisfied"; 2= "dissatisfied"; 3= "mostly dissatisfied"; 4= "mostly satisfied"; 5= "satisfied"; 6= "very satisfied."

TABLE 16-A

Post-Assessment Survey of
BORN FREE
National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Ratings of Specific Activities Within the Institute			
Wednesday			
1. Presentation: Systems Approaches to Program Development	92	3.804	1.092
2. Presentation: Resistance to Change	97	2.546	1.118
3. Videotape: Men: Choices and Changes	88	3.489	1.061
4. Presentation: Racism/Sexism in Career Options	102	4.186	1.115
5. Rationale & Discussing of Literature Reviews (Level Groups)	54	3.407	1.073
6. Introduction to Implementation Plans (PIP's)	101	3.139	.970
Thursday			
7. Career Family Tree (DDG's)	86	3.616	1.229
8. Videotape: Women: Choices and Changes	65	3.908	.980
9. Videotape: Parenting--Three Generations	51	3.980	.860
10. Videotape: Parents as Influencers	51	3.961	.128
11. Resource Panel: Elementary	58	3.310	1.158
12. Resource Panel: Secondary	72	3.583	1.097
13. Resource Panel: Postsecondary	79	3.797	1.091
14. Implementation Planning II (PIP's)	97	3.433	1.040
15. Resource Sharing (Thursday Night)	58	3.897	1.003

*Responses are coded as follows: 1 = "not at all useful"; 2 = "slightly useful"; 3 = "moderately useful"; 4 = "quite useful"; 5 = "very useful"

TABLE 16-A (continued)

Post-Assessment Survey of

BORN FREE

National Institute Participants

Descriptive Statistics*

Item	N**	$\bar{X}$	SD
Friday			
16. Joe Househusband (DGG's)	46	3.457	1.242
17. Implementation Planning III (Morning and Afternoon sessions)	94	3.521	1.251
18. Brown Bag Discussion: Using Training Materials (Level Groups)	72	4.014	1.000
19. Videotape: Why Change?	66	4.045	.983
20. Videotape: Schools as Influencers	58	4.190	.783
21. Videotape: College as Influencers	60	4.117	.922
Saturday			
22. Sharing Implementation Plans (Level Groups)	69	3.409	1.297
23. Presentation of Implementation Plans	22	3.471	.244

*Responses are coded as follows: 1= "not at all useful"; 2= "slightly useful"; 3= "moderately useful"; 4= "quite useful"; 5= "very useful"; NA= "not applicable."

**Number of respondents varies because of nonresponse by some participants at post-assessment.

TABLE 17-A

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Section I: Institute's Impact on You

E.1. I feel my awarenesses have changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

Response Examples:

"Increased awareness of my own stereotypical reaction to relationships with men (seeking acceptance, etc.). The enormity of the task of reducing sex-role stereotyping throughout the educational system."

"My family career background - the number of women in high level positions - great support/role model group. Career education is not dead or dying or waning, but entrenching."

"I have become acquainted with literature and training techniques which will be useful in designing workshops (awareness) for staff personnel on all levels."

"More aware of power of models in changing attitude and awareness. More aware of my parental sex-role stereotyping regarding my children."

E.2. I feel my knowledge has changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

Response Examples:

"Increased knowledge of wealth of materials and resources available. Consultants commented on some specific points which were new to me - details of their interventions in their school systems."

"More knowledge on change process and program development."

"I have been made aware of strategies that might be helpful in increasing awareness of sex-role stereotyping attitudes."

"More knowledgeable regarding career development principles and strategies for intervention."

E.3. I feel my skills have changed as a result of the Institute in the following ways:

Response Examples:

"Using different techniques for planning activities. Using different techniques in the workshops. Using new strategies to help people change attitudes."

"I have come up with good ideas for presenting at workshops and organizing workshop panels."

"More skills in group and group leadership, planning process - some skill increase in changing others. Skills in confrontation."

"I'm not sure my skills have changed - but I'm more aware of how to use them better."

TABLE 17-A (continued)

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions
Section I: Institute's Impact on You

E.4. I feel my attitudes/values have changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

Response Examples:

"Attitudes - See the issue of sex-role stereotyping as much, much more important to deal with than I ever did before. Values - I value making myself aware of personal, group and institutional sex-role stereotyping, clarifying where myself and others are at and analyzing that position with input to help myself and others - look at what can be done to eliminate it."

"Stressed again (for myself) the need for continual assessment of my attitudes - how they've affected my decisions and how they influence my clients."

"Stronger commitment to helping my own children find options. Help parents, especially of girls, to realize critical nature of freer futures for girls. Continued commitment to all women for open options."

"Increased commitment to working in the area of reducing sex-role stereotyping problems for all people."

E.5. I feel my behaviors changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

Response Examples:

"Commitment to monitoring own and other sex stereotyping and sex-role effect on career development."

"I will classroom test the materials from Born Free. I will be able to talk to others concerning Born Free goals."

"To be more careful - more aware of the sexist and racist comments that I may use which stereotype people and therefore reinforce these feelings of limitations which I should be trying to change."

"In my personal program of establishing and developing relationships,(particularly with men), I have found good opportunities to practice. I think this may have been helped by the fact that most men here are consciously working on the same thing."

E.6. The one thing I gained most from this Institute was:

Response Examples:

"A share in the commitment to the issues and the strong human feelings of the staff; the modeling offered by Sunny (Hansen) and many of the staff has been very powerful."

"A wealth of materials and knowledge of where I am at this moment in time. This came about through group sessions and tape observations mostly."

TABLE 17-A (continued)

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions
Section I: Institute's Impact on You

E.6. The one thing I gained most from this Institute was: (continued)

Response Examples:

"Information packet - resource material and confidence to train. Very important to me to be able to interact with others - professionals, competent women, especially."

"What appears to be an excellent set of materials and contact with a fine group of people including Project staff."

E.7. One thing I had hoped to gain from this Institute but did not was:

Response Examples:

"More interaction with the staff as well as internal consultants."

"More in-depth coverage, but I think that will come with reading literature reviews. Tremendous amount of expertise is present among participants. It was only near end of week that this was utilized."

"More opportunity for dialog on deeper issues of sexuality, socialization process of males and females."

"Nothing, it met my expectations."

E.8. One thing I gained from this Institute but did not anticipate initially was:

Response Examples:

"Contact with staff members."

"The expertise, resources available from other participants."

"Valuable resources in the form of videotapes."

"A bonding via needs, experiences, sharing, learning - with all levels - on a continuum - and this has helped - will help - me to rekindle after burn-out at Post-secondary level."

TABLE 18-A

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Section II: Evaluation of the Institute

C.1. The three most satisfying aspects and/or activities of this Institute were:

Response Examples:

"Shared materials; Born Free materials; contact with staff - presentations - sharing."

"Gaining greater insight into my own head; becoming more aware of women's position; the retreat and developmental growth groups."

"Association with participants; material we received; small group work."

"Network establishment; building state team; getting materials."

C.2. The three least satisfying aspects and/or activities of the Institute were:

Response Examples:

"The bathroom; bus rides; sitting so much - I got tired of reception learning."

"Dissemination of materials - method of, so much loose paper that will be in a poor state by the time I reach my state; jetting around to all the different locations; housing arrangements."

"Breakfasts; busses; implementation group."

"Dormitories; looseness of sessions on developing implementation plans; having to travel to St. Paul Campus."

TABLE 19-A

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Section III: Conclusions and Recommendations

A.1. Did the Institute meet your personal expectations? How so?

Response Examples:

"I am now ready to implement strategies to our target group."

"Some. I try to remain open minded but I really didn't have defined expectations when I arrived. As the week progressed I got in touch with myself. I became aware that what I really wanted was "How to" and you responded beautifully."

"I thought the Institute would concentrate more on sex-role stereotyping. Lack of career education background material, issued beforehand, caused the Institute to get off to a slow start for me."

"The Institute gave me what I needed, which was to increase my awareness of sex-role stereotyping."

A.2. Hypothetically speaking, if you had it to do over again on deciding to come to the Institute, would you have changed your decision, knowing what you now know about what the Institute would be like? If yes, please explain why.

Response Examples:

"No" (majority of responses, N=79)

"I would ask that presentations be more directly geared to this audience. Most of us are already doing many of the activities. The groups to discuss how to implement the material were much more useful."

"Yes - it does not seem that consideration was made of the various levels. We all came with different agendas - and different purposes. I am going to be active in in-service workshops related to this topic and subsequently I really needed to become familiar with Born Free materials. On the other hand, the secondary information received was fantastic."

"No. I would still come. Monday through Friday night might have been better."

A.3. Do you plan to use the various training materials (printed modules, literature reviews, video tape) you received in follow-up workshops with persons in your institution or state? If no, why not?

Response Examples:

"Yes" (N=96)

"Yes, but with revisions to meet the needs of my audiences."

"Yes, I will translate some of the materials myself with the help of personnel from the local level or writing a proposal to do so."

TABLE 19-A (continued)

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Section III: Conclusions and Recommendations

A.3. Do you plan to use the various training materials (printed modules, literature reviews, video tape) you received in follow-up workshops with persons in your institution or state? If no, why not? (continued)

Response Examples:

"Modules - yes, parts of. Literature reviews - doubtful as written, although the information in them may be used. Videotapes - only "Schools As Influencers." The others - highly doubtful although I'd like to field test all the tapes."

A.4. Would you like to field test additional videotapes? Which ones?

Response Examples:

"Yes. All that are available, but 1,2,3,8,9 in particular."

"Yes. I will write or call for requests and will let you know which ones at that time."

"Yes. The or[illegible]ealing with "Schools As Influencers," "Colleges as [illegible]encers," and "Parents as Influencers.""

"Absolutely. [illegible]olleges As Influencers," "Why Change?", particularly. All of them would be useful for some aspect of my work."

TABLE 20 -A

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Section III: Conclusions and Recommendations

B.1. Your recommendations for the Institute: What changes in content would you recommend (additions, deletions)?

Response Examples:

"None"

"I appreciated the opportunity to share with people at my own level. A structural time of sharing resources perhaps more than once."

"Perhaps more open-ended time in DGG (Developmental Growth Groups); meeting individuals openly and honestly about these crucial issues takes time and we didn't have enough."

"More time to go over material with Born Free leaders. More time for idea exchanges."

B.2. Your recommendations for the Institute: What changes in sequencing or structuring the contents would you recommend?

Response Examples:

"Send out information by 1st class mail to better prepare us."

"Keep activities varied and experiential. Throw out lecturing, much sitting--passive stuff. Give choices (as you did)! Use expertise of participants more fully, (ie, publicize; but time was limited)."

"Let participants state needs earlier - you were fantastic in adjusting - it would have been easier if you'd done a pre-assessment needs survey - more opportunity to choose interest sections."

"No changes. The structure Thursday and Friday changed adequately so that implementation teams could have enough time to do their projects."

B.3. Your recommendations for the Institute: What other changes (length of Institute participant selection, facilities, staffing, etc.) would you recommend?

Response Examples:

"Better housing; less travelling; an informal get-together on evening of arrival; staff live in with participants; more time - now I am ready to get on with this - add another 3 days; audit or credit should be a choice."

"Length great; participant selection great; facilities ugh! beautiful campus; staffing great; rec. - tour of campus - but another facility for use."

"Monday through Friday for me would have been helpful. Information was not received in my state and responded to. I received information at a conference. Facilities could have been better (Dorm Housing) location in one place. Staffing fine and Diane Johnson was helpful in our group! Don't keep saying we are off schedule."

TABLE 20-A (continued)

Summary of Institute Participants' Responses to Questions

Section III: Conclusions and Recommendations

B.3. Your recommendations for the Institute: What other changes (length of Institute participant selection, facilities, staffing, etc.) would you recommend? (continued)

Response Examples: "Length was fine - put folks in a group and let them stay with it. You could combine groups but don't constantly shift them from one to another."

Appendix B-1

Northwestern College
Roseville, Minnesota

Retreat Agenda - June 13-17, 1978

8:00 A.M.	Bus leaves Frontier Hall (promptly)
8:30 - 8:45	Arrive at Northwestern College Register - Bev, Gerri, Linda
8:45 - 9:15	Activity: Name Tag and Career Mixer - Tim, Anne, Fred
9:15 - 9:45	BORN FREE Institute Overview and Staff Introductions - Sunny, Tim, Diane, staff
9:45 - 10:45	Activity: Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development (Developmental Growth Groups--DGG) - Terri, Phil, Jim
10:45 - 11:00	Break
11:00 - 12:30	Presentation: Career Development Framework for Sex Role Issues - Sunny and Anne Discussion: Char, Mary Ann, Terri, Fred
12:30 - 2:30	Lunch and Recreation
2:30 - 3:30	Activity: Career Life Line - (DGG) - Tim and Diane
3:30 - 4:30	Videotape: "BORN FREE: A World of Options" Discussion: Phyl, Sue, Dee
4:30 - 6:00	Activity: Collage - Networking of Problems and Solutions - Gerri, Warren, Bev
6:00 - 7:00	Dinner
7:00 - 8:00	Activity: Magic Seminar - Doug and Barb
8:00 - 8:30	Processing - Staff
8:30 P.M.	Bus leaves for Frontier Hall

OUTLINE: BORN FREE SUMMER INSTITUTE

June 13 - 17, 1978

Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping

L. Sunny Hansen, Beverly Mills-Novoa, Tim Hatfield, Doug Pelcak, Sue Warsett, Phillip Penn, Diane Johnson, Terri Teeson, Anne Boe, Linda Emery, Warren Shaffer, Gerri Perreault, Barbara Lofgren, Phyllis Kragseth, Fred Krusemark, Dolores Dege, Charlene Follett, Jim Harper, Mary Ann Watt, Shelly Heck.

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES:

(1) To increase awareness of one's own attitudes, behavior, and career socialization

(2) To increase knowledge and awareness of sex-role socialization and stereotyping

(3) To increase knowledge of career development concepts and programs as related to sex roles

(4) To increase knowledge and skills in change process and organizational intervention

(5) To increase repertoire of skills and materials in workshop design and training

Tues., June 13	RETREAT - Northwestern College, Roseville, Minnesota	
*Wed., June 14	8:30	Administrative Detail Assignments and Format - Sunny Financial Arrangements - Bev Writing in Logs - Gerri
	9:00-10:00	Systems Approaches to Program Development - Sunny
	10:00-10:20	Break
	10:20-10:40	Resistance to Change - Warren
	10:40-11:30	"Men:Choices and Changes" Videotape--Discussion - Tim and Beverly Rooms B45, COB, P12 and 15
	11:30- 1:00	Lunch
	1:00- 2:00	Racism/Sexism in Career Options - Vivian Nelson
	2:00- 3:00	Rationale and Discussion of Reviews of Literature Char, Mary Ann, Anne, Diane, Tim, Terri, Jim, Doug and Dee
	3:00- 4:00	Introduction to Implementation Plans — Work Session I By State and Region, with Teams and Facilitators
	ASSIGNMENT:	Write in Logs; Read Change Process Evaluation Reports

* Thurs., June 15	8:30	Administrative Details
	8:45-10:00	Career Family Tree (DGG) - Barb and Jim
	10:00-10:20	Break
	10:20-12:00	Videotapes Tape 3: "Women: Choices and Changes"-Sue and Gerri Tape 5: "Parenting-Three Generations"-Phyl and Phil Tape 6: "Parents as Influencers"-Fred and Dee
	12:00- 1:30	Lunch with Resource Guests - St. Paul Student Center
	1:30- 3:00	Implementing BORN FREE Goals Resource Panel--External Consultants-Barb, Tim, Doug Internal Consultants- Clare Hibbard, Jon Rubin, Vicky Weis, Dave Grout, (Institutional Analyses,Problem Assessment, Implementation Strategies, and Continuation Plans)
	3:00- 4:00	Implementation Plans--Work Session II (Teams meet with Resource Field Site Staff and Facilitators)
	ASSIGNMENT:	Write in Logs: Read Fact Pack, Review Training Packet
	EVENING:	Resource Sharing
*Fri., June 16	8:30	Administrative Detail
	8:45-10:00	Joe Househusband (DGG) - Doug and Char
	10:00-10:20	Break
	10:30-12:00	Option I - Meet with Education Level Consultants for discussion of how to use materials Option II - Videotape viewing
	12:00- 1:30	Lunch
	1:30- 3:00	Videotapes Tape 9: "Why Change" - Sue and Diane Tape 7: "Schools as Influencers" - Terri and Doug Tape 8: "Colleges as Influencers" - Barb and Tim
	3:00- 4:00	Implementation Plans--Work Session III
	6:30	Dinner at Campus Club - Coffman Memorial Union, Minneapolis Campus
**Sat., June 17	8:30	Administrative Detail
	8:45-10:00	Share Implementation Plans--Session IV - Small Groups
	10:00-10:15	Break
	10:15-12:15	Presentation of Implementation Plans - Large Group (Facilitators, Recorders, Presenters)
	12:15-12:45	Evaluation - Fred and Sue
	12:45- 2:45	Wrap-Up - Sunny and Staff
	1:15- 2:00	Lunch
		Adjourn

*8:30-4:00 St. Paul Campus, B45 Classroom Office Bldg., Rooms 12 and 15 Palmer
**8:30-2:00 Minneapolis Campus, Room 155 Ford Hall, Rooms 150 and 160

CAROLYN WARNER
SUPERINTENDENT

Arizona
Department of Education
1535 WEST JEFFERSON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007
271-4361

JUN 30 1978

June 28, 1978

Dr. L. Sunny Hansen
Project BORN FREE
139 Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive, S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dear Sunny:

I wanted to write and express my appreciation to you for the BORN FREE Conference. The efforts you and your staff have put forth over the past two years have been remarkable. The materials will be put to use in Arizona as they are exactly what consultants in our state funded Career Education Projects have been asking for to facilitate the infusion of awareness of sex role stereotyping into the Career Education concept.

Enclosed is the most recent list of the Sex Equity Coordinators for the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. Any encouragement you give to the BORN FREE participants to link up with the sex equity consultants in their home states would really be appreciated.

Again, thank you for the contribution BORN FREE has made to enhancing sex equity efforts.

Sincerely,

Deborah J. Dillon, Specialist
Sex Bias and Stereotyping

T2/dn/01/6.23

Enclosure

CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

• BOARD OF EDUCATION
Larry J. Goodman
Kathie McKenney
S. J. Mediati
Dr. Edwin K. Reuling
Larry L. Todd

• Francis J. Ebert, Ed.D., Superintendent

• M. Dale Lambert
Assistant Superintendent

P.O. BOX 2146 • CASTRO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA • 94546 • 415-537-3000

June 19, 1978

Appendix C-2

L. Sunny Hansen, Director
BORN FREE Project
College of Education
139 Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Sunny -

It is Monday morning and I am back in California trying to get a handle on Prop. 13 and what the future holds for many of us. But before I get into that kind of 'grisly' schedule I want to thank you and your staff for an excellent week of very purposeful activities and personal involvement.

I know the workshop had some low spots for you but I would like you to know that the consensus of everyone I talked with was that it was more than worth the effort. The essence of the workshop was the interaction between your very fine staff and the marvelous assortment of people that gathered to work with them. I cannot say too much for the support network that developed out of the small groups, and I felt for the first time in many years a sense of belonging and a sense of support. This kind of emotional uplift happens very rarely and I thank you for it.

Becky Newland and I will continue to work with the State Department of Education and Project Equity in pursuing the goals espoused at the conference. I am ready to assist in whatever way I can and I hope that sabbatical plans may include a trip West so we can return some of your hospitality.

My love to you and the entire Born Free staff.

Robert L. Forbes
Secondary Instruction Administrator

RLF:lmb

DISTRICT OFFICE
3300 Norbridge Ave.
Castro Valley, Ca.
94546

ROBERT S. EICHER, *Area President*

Southeast community college

August 9, 1978

Dear Sunny,

Thought I would drop you a note on what I've been doing since the conference.

Upon returning to my college I put on a short presentation to the college student services staff concerning BORN FREE and the Video Tape. My office-mate and I started off with the reading MASCULINE/FEMININE, I did some de-synthazation/ relaxation exercises for about five minutes prior to the reading and then we switched roles (my office mate is a female), and the effect was very rewarding. I then showed the video-tape and led the discussion. I felt the 1½ hour presentation went well and the evaluation forms confirmed it. The presentation was timely because the staff was in the process of developing a Counselor/Advisor handbook and I got some BORN FREE materials included in it. One thing did come up, not only here but in other presentations; and quite frankly I am at loss in how to handle it. The most negative reactions to the BORN FREE concept are that it is another "women's thing", I can handle that, but the comments are coming from minorities, predominately black-males. They feel that this is something new, and "WASP" oriented. I get the feeling from them that BORN FREE is a threat to Black Rights because of a shifting in energy on the part of educators and society, that enough hasn't been done with blacks period, and now there is a women's movement that will cause a shift in emphasis/ priorities, and that the Black movement will have to take a back sent. Do you know if any other people are experiencing this, or do you have any suggestions?

I am also working with different instructors in utilizing materials for student consumption making them aware of sex-stereotyping. These consist of the androgyng test and other values-oriented things from the workbook, resulting in some good discussions and problem solving on the part of the students.

BEATRICE CAMPUS
Box 767
Beatrice, Ne 68310

FAIRBURY CAMPUS
10th & K Street
Fairbury, Ne 68352

LINCOLN CAMPUS
2120 So. 56th St.
Suite 206
Lincoln, Ne 68506

MILFORD CAMPUS
Milford, Ne 68405

ROBERT S. EICHER, *Area President*

Southeast community college

Also enclosed is a PR handbook which my office-mate just did. It was interesting that the only feed-back we got from dept. heads and instructors was why Nursing, Medical, Secretarial, and Clerical weren't mentioned!

We also submitted a grant proposal for work shop funding in non-traditional careers, and sex-role stereotyping at the Post-Secondary level.

Nancy Brandt and I are also putting on two work shops at the Nebraska Vocational Educational Conference, 8/14/78, entitled "Expanding Career Options." Since most of the participants are teachers, Nancy and I put together a packet from the workbook consisting of many "hands-on" things for teachers and students. We are also having some films being shoed continously in the lobby, (see enclosed).

So in closing, we have been quite busy and are appreciating more and more the workbooks and the ground work that your project did.

Sincerely yours,

Gregory B Peters

Gregory B. Peters, Director
Career Planning Center
2240 Vine Street
Lincoln, NE 68503

Appendix C-4

LSU
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70803

Equal Opportunity Programs Office

504/388-1471

JUN 26 1978

June 22, 1978

Dr. L. Sunny Hansen, Director
139 Burton Hall
178 Pillsbury Drive, S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dear Dr. Hansen:

I have just returned to LSU after completing the Born Free National Training Institute. The experience was enlightening and will be helpful to me in many ways in my work as Director of Equal Opportunity Programs here at LSU.

The materials you have developed are rich with resources, aids, and ideas for adapting the Born Free model to a variety of situations. The materials have drawn together any number of resources that were previously inaccessible.

My experience as former Director of the La. Bureau of Women and Deputy Director of the La. Division of Human Services makes me realize that your Born Free model is by far the best plan that has been developed for dealing with the issue of sex stereotyping. It is not only exemplary in content but comprehensible, usable, and transferable. It is an example of cutting through the rhetoric and directing the action. I sincerely hope the persons responsible for the administration of the Women's Educational Equity Act programs will recognize the strides you have made and will devote additional resources to strengthening the program. The model needs follow-up and solidification to make it the viable instrument we have waited for so long.

If I can be of any assistance to you in your project please feel free to call on me.

Yours for equality,

Gwen Redding

Gwen Redding, Director
Equal Opportunity Programs

GR:cr

LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

3401 Century Avenue White Bear Lake, Minnesota 55110 (612) 770-1331

March 1, 1978

I am pleased to take this opportunity to introduce you to Project BORN FREE and to invite your support of the BORN FREE National Institute to be held June 13-17, 1978 at the University of Minnesota.

BORN FREE is a two year training and development project funded by the Women's Educational Equity Act of the U.S. Office of Education. The project focuses on exposing educators to ways in which they can expand career options for both women and men in their own institutions. Dr. L. Sunny Hansen, a professor in the Department of Psychoeducational Studies at the University of Minnesota, is the Project Director.

The BORN FREE National Institute will bring together leaders in education from all over the country and from the full range of educational institutions (elementary, secondary, community college, and university) for an intensive training experience. These leaders (from faculty, administration, and student personnel) will experience validated print and video training materials developed by over 100 project staff in 14 Minnesota schools and colleges. All will receive copies of some of these career development packets for their own use upon their return home. After the Institute, participants will serve as resource persons within their home states or territories.

Your help is needed to identify one or two teachers, counselors, or administrators in your state who 1) share a commitment to issues of sex bias in career options, 2) would like to participate in the National Institute, and 3) would be willing to implement follow-up workshops or activities back home. Two participants will be selected from each state. More information about the Institute and the nomination process is given in the enclosed letter from Professor L. Sunny Hansen.

Because the project cuts across so many units of state education agencies (e.g. counseling, instruction, human relations, career education, vocational education), this letter is being sent to the Chief State School Officer.

Several elementary and secondary schools here in Minnesota are participants in Project BORN FREE. Early indications from last year's workshop evaluation and field testing of training packets are that BORN FREE materials are effective in helping educators examine ways in which they positively and negatively affect the career development of students.

has made and the impact it appears to be having in our institutions. We believe this Project is worthy of your involvement.

We hope that you will read the enclosed material carefully and support Project BORN FREE in any way you can, but especially by making nominations, sharing the information, and providing support for follow-up activities. Please note deadlines.

Sincerely,

Carl Gerber

Carl Gerber
President
Lakewood Community College

Dale Lorenz

Dale Lorenz
President
Normandale Community College

Enclosures

P.S. June is a delightful month to be in Minnesota.

Appendix C-6

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March 10, 1978

I am pleased to take this opportunity to introduce you to Project BORN FREE and to invite your support of the BORN FREE National Institute to be held June 13-17, 1978, here at the University of Minnesota.

BORN FREE is a two-year training and development project funded by the Woman's Educational Equity Act of the U.S. Office of Education. The project focuses on exposing educators to ways in which they can expand career options for both women and men in their own institutions. Dr. L. Sunny Hansen, a professor in the Department of Psychoeducational Studies here, is the Project Director.

The BORN FREE National Institute will bring together leaders in education (elementary, secondary, community college, and university) for an intensive training experience. These leaders from faculty, administration, and student personnel will experience validated print and video training materials developed by over 100 project staff members in 14 Minnesota schools and colleges. All will receive copies of some of these career development packets for their own use upon their return home. After the Institute, participants will serve as resource persons within their home states or territories.

Your help is needed to identify leaders in institutions of higher education within your state who share a commitment to this issue and would like to participate in the National Institute and in implementing follow-up activities. Two participants will be selected from each state. More information about the Institute and the nomination process is given in the enclosed letter from Professor Hansen.

We at Minnesota are happy to be a part of this national effort to widen career opportunities for students through reducing sex role stereotyping in education. I hope that you will read the enclosed material carefully and support Project BORN FREE through sharing this information, and through your nominations and follow-up activity assistance. Please note the early deadlines.

We think your participants will find June a delightful time to be in Minnesota.

Cordially,

C. Peter Magrath

C. Peter Magrath
President

CPM:nw

Appendix C-7

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology • Psychoeducational Studies
College of Education • 139 Burton Hall • 178 Pillsbury Drive S.E.
University of Minnesota • Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
DIRECTOR L. SUNNY HANSEN 373-0202
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS BEVERLY MILLS-NOVOA, GERRI PERREAULT 373-5558

Build Options, Reassess Norms • Free Roles through Educational Equity

March 10, 1978

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to invite you to nominate one or two educators from your state or institution to attend the BORN FREE National Institute and to enlist your support for this important effort.

The Institute will be held June 13-17, 1978, at the University of Minnesota. It is planned as an intensive workshop to train leaders in education from the full spectrum of institutions, elementary through post-secondary schools, to use materials in implementing the goals of Project BORN FREE within their states. From a pool of nominations solicited from prominent educators nationwide, two participants will be selected to represent each state. After the Institute, they will serve as resource persons and trainers back in their home state or territory.

Project BORN FREE. This is a developmental project designed to expand career options for both women and men through reduction of career-related sex-role stereotyping in education. In the past year and a half, 14 schools, colleges and vocational-technical institutions in the state of Minnesota have worked collaboratively with BORN FREE staff to develop and field-test training materials designed to help educators and parents become aware of the ways in which they limit or facilitate the career development of children, youth and adults. Over 100 teachers, counselors and administrators working in these institutions have gone through a pilot training workshop using the materials and are in the process of implementing plans to reduce sex bias in career options in their own institutions. The project has gained much national visibility and appears to have a wide base of appeal among those concerned with equity for women and men.

Purpose of the National Institute. The National Institute is an attempt to multiply the effects of BORN FREE nationwide. While there is much activity in the area of equity through Title IX, Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, Affirmative Action and other programs, the BORN FREE approach offers participants a chance for positive personal growth as well as tools to have a more positive impact on student career development. Evaluations of our first Summer Institute were overwhelmingly enthusiastic and provided evidence of achieving desired outcomes.

Participants will be expected to commit themselves to serve as resource persons and to implement at least three training workshops for educators in their

The University of Minnesota is an Equal Opportunity Educator and Employer

own states, according to a plan devised by them at the Institute. A follow-up evaluation will be made six months later.

The Project will provide each participant with 1) a set of validated training materials, including a training packet and one videotape, "A World of Options"; 2) three credits of graduate training in Counseling Psychology/Career Development through the University of Minnesota; 3) technical assistance and a support network from BORN FREE headquarters in Minneapolis, until September 1978; 4) financial support up to $225 to cover a per diem and validation and training costs.

Nomination and Selection Criteria. I hope that you will nominate for participation in the Institute one or two leaders from your state or institution. Two nominees from each state, one from K-12 and one from post-secondary and higher education institutions, will be selected. Applications are also being accepted from individuals who wish to nominate themselves. Although not all nominees will be selected for participation, there may be opportunities for them to be involved in follow-up workshops within their state. The criteria for selection of two from each state are as follows:

1) Potential high-impact educational leaders, change agents, and opinion influencers
2) One from K-12; one from post-secondary or higher education
3) One from counseling or student personnel; one from instructional areas or administration
4) A balance of both sexes, as much as possible
5) Commitment to the goals of BORN FREE
6) Past experience and/or training in career development, organizational change and staff development
7) Commitment to attend a full-day retreat and all workshop activities
8) Commitment to implement training by conducting three follow-up workshops as resource person and trainer in home state
9) Multiethnic representation

Needed Financial Support. Because of limitations in the regulations under which BORN FREE is funded, we can offer each participant financial support up to $225. We are not allowed to cover transportation expenses. To assure that your state will be well represented by the best leadership, we are urging that your State Department of Education and/or other educational institutions share costs for participants attending the Institute. This probably would not exceed $400 per person.

In addition, we are requesting that state education agencies and educational institutions seek ways to provide financial support for implementing the follow-up workshops and other activities at the state level. Possibly funds available for human relations leadership training under TITLE III could be allocated for this important purpose. Funds available through guidance and counseling, career education, vocational education, and similar sources should also be considered. We believe that it will be advantageous to each state to have access to BORN FREE materials and trained leadership to implement training programs.

Deadlines. Because of our need to begin the selection process as soon as possible, we need to hear from you very soon. Will you please return the enclosed postcard indicating your willingness to participate in Project BORN FREE within 2 weeks. Please ask your nominees to confirm their interest by completing the enclosed Institute application and including a one-page summary of their experience and training. The deadline for applications is March 31, 1978, with selection notification during the week of April 20.

Thank you for your interest in and support of this important area of human development. We look forward to your early reply. If you have questions, please call Beverly Mills-Novoa, Gerri Perreault or me at the BORN FREE office, (612) - 373-5558 or 373-0202.

Sincerely,

L. Sunny Hansen, Ph.D.
Director
Project BORN FREE

PRE-ASSESSMENT SURVEY OF BORN FREE INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

Name of Participant: _____

State: _____

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this pre-assessment survey is to obtain a baseline measure from which we can judge the Institute's actual impact on you and the other participants. On the following pages, you are asked to first provide background information on yourself, your institution (or state agency) and your state. Also requested is information on your present awareness, knowledge, skills and attitudes/values related to the goals and content of the Institute. While you may have already supplied some of the above information with your application materials, it is important that you complete all of the questions on this survey. Since the Institute includes such a diverse group of participants, certain questions (e.g., Institutional Background Information questions) may not apply to all participants; however, please respond to all questions that apply. The term, "Institution," refers to school, college or state educational agency.

Please respond as candidly as possible--your responses should reflect the actual and present status. Your responses will be treated as confidential in that all data analyses to be discussed in the evaluation report of the Institute will be with aggregrate data--no individual responses will be identified.

Before starting with the questions on the next page, please be sure to write your name and state on the cover of this survey. Thanks!

A. Personal Background Information

This information on personal background is requested because such information may be significant in explaining variations in how persons respond to items in later sections of this questionnaire. However, it is recognized that certain requested information may be considered as quite personal. Therefore, feel free to not respond to any question that you feel infringes on your personal privacy. While we acknowledge this sensitive issue, we would hope that you will be willing to provide us with as much information as possible. Your responses will be treated as confidential, i.e., no individual data will be released to any source.

Please check the appropriate box or fill in the blank as indicated.

1. Age: _____ 2. Sex: _____

3. Ethnic Background:

( ) Asian American ( ) Chicano/Hispanic

( ) Black ( ) Indian/Native American

( ) Caucasian ( ) Other _____ (please specify)

4. Marital Status: _____

If married, please indicate your spouse's work position and family responsibilities.

_____

_____

_____

5. Are you a parent? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please list the number of female and male children.

Number of female children: _____ Number of male children: _____

6. What degrees have you received and in what fields?

( ) Associate in _____

( ) Bachelor's in _____

( ) Master's in _____

( ) Specialist's in _____

( ) Doctorate in _____

( ) Post-Doctorate in _____

7. What special training (courses, workshops) have you had that relates directly to this Institute?

_____

_____

_____

8. Previous leadership experiences:

( ) staff development/inservice programs

( ) educational improvement programs

( ) career development/career education programs

( ) affirmative action /sex discrimination programs

9. Your current position (title and primary duties):

_____

_____

10. Number of years in current position: _____

11. Name of your agency/institution, including the name of your specific unit:

_____

12. Number of years you have worked in your agency/institution: _____

13. Starting from your current position, list significant work experiences you have had throughout your career and the time spent in each position.

Position	Number of years
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

14. In what position do you expect to be five years from now?

_____

15. How would you describe your own career development, including the influence of traditional sex roles and stereotypes?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Did you already read any of the reading materials sent earlier?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If yes, please check which article(s).

( ) "A Career Management Model for Counselor Involvement"

( ) "BORN FREE: A Collaborative Consultation Model for Career Development and Sex Role Stereotyping"

( ) "Male is Greater than Female: The Socialization of Status Inequality"

( ) "The Politics of Training Teachers in Schools"

( ) "BORN FREE Literature Review"

B. Institutional Background Information

Please respond to the following statements concerning your institution by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your agreement with the statement. If a statement does not apply or if you cannot respond, circle "NA."

1 = completely disagree
2 = mostly disagree
3 = mostly agree
4 = completely agree

1. In the past my institution has actively and successfully sponsored programs concerned with problems of career development.

1 2 3 4 NA

2. Currently, the staff morale at my institution is quite good.

1 2 3 4 NA

3. Most of the male students in my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex role stereotypes can limit their own career development

1 2 3 4 NA

4. The current economic situation of my institution would significantly limit the number of activities that could be employed to reduce sex role stereotyping practices.

1 2 3 4 NA

5. Most of the female staff within my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex role stereotypes can limit their own career development.

1 2 3 4 NA

6. Most of the staff within my insititution are very concerned about how their sex role stereotyping attitudes and practices may limit the career options of students.

1 2 3 4 NA

7. The current time demands upon the staff in my institution would significantly limit the amount of cooperation or help the staff could give to help reduce career-related sex role stereotyping attitudes or practices within my institution.

1 2 3 4 NA

8. There are many practices in my institutions that encourage sex role stereotyping for male students.

1 2 3 4 NA

9. Generally, my institution's policies and practices are very responsive and open to change; thus, I expect that a number of changes easily could be made in my institution to reduce sex role stereotyping practices without having to make substantial and disruptive changes in the system.

1 2 3 4 NA

10. Most of the male staff within my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex role stereotypes can limit their own career development.

1 2 3 4 NA

11. Presently, there is considerable tension between male and female staff in my institution concerning sex bias and discrimination issues.

1 2 3 4 NA

12. In the past, my institution has actively and successfully sponsored programs concerned with problems of sex bias and discrimination.

1 2 3 4 NA

13. There are many practices in my institution that encourage sex role stereotypes for female students.

1 2 3 4 NA

14. My institution is neither presently facing or will be facing an immediate crisis that will overshadow all other issues or concerns such as career-related sex role stereotyping.

1 2 3 4 NA

15. Most of the female students in my institution are aware of and concerned about how sex role stereotypes can limit their own career development.

1 2 3 4 NA

16. My institution's administration will openly and actively support efforts to reduce sex role stereotyping attitudes and practices that may limit the career development of students.

1 2 3 4 NA

C. State Background Information

Please respond to the following statements concerning your state by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your agreement with a statement. If a statement does not apply or if you cannot respond, circle "NA."

1 = completely disagree
2 = mostly disagree
3 = mostly agree
4 = completely agree

1. Within my state, the legislature has given very little priority, if any, to redressing sex inequalities and sex discrimination practices in general.

1 2 3 4 NA

2. Compared to what other states spend on public education, my state spends at least as much as if not more than what most other states spend.

1 2 3 4 NA

3. The issue of career education is one given top priority throughout my state with substantial state funds allocated or available for developing or improving career education/career development programs.

1 2 3 4 NA

4. My state has a comprehensive "career education" plan in which the influence of sex role stereotyping in one's career development is recognized and addressed.

1 2 3 4 NA

5. Throughout my state most, if not all, educational institutions at my level either currently are or will be shortly facing dramatic enrollment declines which are, in turn, having significant negative side effects.

1 2 3 4 NA

6. In general, most of my state's educational institutions at my level are very supportive of Title IX (Affirmative Action) both in the letter and the spirit of the law.

1 2 3 4 NA

7. The top education officials in my state will be willing to support (fund) extensive inservice training of state educators to reduce sex role stereotyping practices in state educational institutions.

1 2 3 4 NA

D. Your Present Awareness

Please respond to the following statements below concerning your present awareness of various subjects by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your present awareness of each subject.

1 = not at all aware
2 = slightly aware
3 = moderately aware
4 = quite aware
5 = extremely aware

1. My own career development 1 2 3 4 5

2. My own sex role socialization 1 2 3 4 5

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

3. The influence of sex role stereotypes on my career development	1	2	3	4	5
4. My attitudes concerning sex differences, traditional sex roles vs. androgyny	1	2	3	4	5
5. My own sex role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work	1	2	3	4	5
6. Sex role stereotyping practices at my institution that limit career options of students	1	2	3	4	5
7. Practices at my institution that broaden career options of students	1	2	3	4	5
8. Resources available in my institution that can be used in reducing sex role stereotyping practices	1	2	3	4	5
9. Barriers within my institution that will inhibit my efforts related to reducing sex role stereotyping practices	1	2	3	4	5
10. Resources available in my state that can be used in reducing sex role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	1	2	3	4	5
11. Barriers within my state that will inhibit efforts related to reducing sex role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	1	2	3	4	5

E. Your Present Knowledge

Please respond to the following statements below concerning your present knowledge on various topics by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your present knowledge of a topic.

1 = not at all knowledgeable
2 = slightly knowledgeable
3 = moderately knowledgeable
4 = quite knowledgeable
5 = extremely knowledgeable

1. Career development concepts and applications	1	2	3	4	5

2. Sex role socialization process	1	2	3	4	5
3. Influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development	1	2	3	4	5
4. Androgyny and sex role transcendence	1	2	3	4	5
5. Techniques for eliminating sex role stereotypes	1	2	3	4	5
6. Principles of change process	1	2	3	4	5
7. Principles of program development	1	2	3	4	6

F. Your Present Skills

Please respond to the following statements below concerning your present skills related to various areas by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your present skills related to each area.

1 = not at all skillful
2 = slightly skillful
3 = moderately skillful
4 = quite skillful
5 = extremely skillful

1. Continuous self-analysis regarding my own sex role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors	1	2	3	4	5
2. Recognizing and challenging sex role stereotyping practices of other individuals	1	2	3	4	5
3. Conducting a system diagnosis of my institution and state needs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan	1	2	3	4	5
5. Motivating educators to reduce their sex role stereotyping practices	1	2	3	4	5

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

6. Training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex role stereotyping in their institutions 1 2 3 4 5

G. Present Attitudes/Values

Please respond to the following attitude/value statements by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your agreement with a statement. If a statement does not apply or if you cannot respond, circle "NA."

1 = completely disagree
2 = mostly disagree
3 = mostly agree
4 = completely agree

1. The issue of sex role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females.

1 2 3 4 NA

2. The concept of career should include both work and family.

1 2 3 4 NA

3. The issue of career development and sex role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in my state.

1 2 3 4 NA

4. I am committed to continually monitoring my own sex role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors.

1 2 3 4 NA

5. I am very committed to challenging sex role stereotyping practices of others.

1 2 3 4 NA

6. I am confident that I will be able to make needed changes in my institution and state that will result in expanded career options for all students.

1 2 3 4 NA

POST-ASSESSMENT SURVEY OF
BORN FREE
INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

The three purposes of this post-assessment survey are (1) to determine the Institute's impact on awarenesses, knowledge, skills and attitudes/values that were previously measured in the pre-assessment survey; (2) to obtain your evaluation of the Institute (e.g., design, content, processes, etc.); and (3) to obtain suggestions and recommendations for improving the Institute.

Once again, please respond as candidly as possible. Your honest and frank responses are vital for the purposes of this evaluation. Your responses will be treated as confidential--no individual responses will be identified.

Please fill in your name and state in the lines below and continue on with the questions that follow. Thanks!

Name of Participant: _____

State: _____

I. INSTITUTE'S IMPACT ON YOU

In this section, you are asked to respond to questions concerning your present awareness, knowledge, skills and attitudes/values--these questions are identical to those asked in the pre-assessment survey. The purpose of asking these questions again is to determine if your awarenesses, knowledge, skills or attitudes/values have changed as a result of the Institute. As a check in this method of determining Institute impact, eight open-ended statements concerning the impact of the Institute are included at the end of this section for you to complete.

A. Your Present Awareness

Please respond to the following statements below concerning your present awareness of various subjects by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your present awareness of each subject.

1 = not at all aware
2 = slightly aware
3 = moderately aware
4 = quite aware
5 = extremely aware

1.	My own career development	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My own sex role socialization	1	2	3	4	5
3.	The influence of sex role stereotypes on my career development	1	2	3	4	5
4.	My attitudes concerning sex differences, traditional sex roles vs. androgyny	1	2	3	4	5
5.	My own sex role stereotyping behaviors at home and at work	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Sex role stereotyping practices at my institution that limit career options of students	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Practices at my institution that broaden career options of students	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Resources available in my institution that can be used in reducing sex role stereotyping practices	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Barriers within my institution that will inhibit my efforts related to reducing sex role stereotyping practices	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Resources available in my state that can be used in reducing sex role stereotyping practices in educational institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Barriers within my state that will inhibit efforts related to reducing sex role stereotyping practices in educational institutions	1	2	3	4	5

B. Your Present Knowledge

Please respond to the following statements below concerning your present knowledge on various topics by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your present knowledge of a topic.

1 = not at all knowledgeable
2 = slightly knowledgeable
3 = moderately knowledgeable
4 = quite knowledgeable
5 = extremely knowledgeable

1. Career development concepts and applications	1	2	3	4	5
2. Sex role socialization process	1	2	3	4	5
3. Influence of sex roles and stereotypes on career development	1	2	3	4	5
4. Androgyny and sex role transcendence	1	2	3	4	5
5. Techniques for eliminating sex role stereotypes	1	2	3	4	5
6. Principles of change process	1	2	3	4	5
7. Principles of program development	1	2	3	4	5

C. Your Present Skills

Please respond to the following statements below concerning your present skills related to various areas by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your present skills related to each area.

1 = not at all skillful
2 = slightly skillful
3 = moderately skillful
4 = quite skillful
5 = extremely skillful

1. Continuous self-analysis regarding my own sex role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors	1	2	3	4	5
2. Recognizing and challenging sex role stereotyping practices of other individuals	1	2	3	4	5
3. Conducting a system diagnosis of my institution and state needs	1	2	3	4	5
4. Locating and utilizing available resources needed for implementing an intervention plan	1	2	3	4	5
5. Motivating educators to reduce their sex role stereotyping practices	1	2	3	4	5

6. Training state educators in developing intervention plans to reduce career-related sex role stereotyping in their institutions 1 2 3 4 5

D. Your Present Attitudes/Values

Please respond to the following attitude/value statements by circling the number corresponding to the label you feel best indicates your agreement with a statement. If a statement does not apply or if you cannot respond, circle "NA."

1 = completely disagree
2 = mostly disagree
3 = mostly agree
4 = completely agree

1. The issue of sex role stereotyping is equally important for both males and females.

1 2 3 4 NA

2. The concept of career should include both work and family.

1 2 3 4 NA

3. The issue of career development and sex role stereotyping is extremely important and should be infused into the pre-service preparation of educators in my state.

1 2 3 4 NA

4. I am committed to continually monitoring my own sex role stereotyping attitudes and behaviors.

1 2 3 4 NA

5. I am very committed to challenging sex role stereotyping practices of others.

1 2 3 4 NA

6. I am confident that I will be able to make needed changes in my institution and state that will result in expanded career options for all students.

1 2 3 4 NA

E. Open-Ended Statements

Please complete the statements below in any way you desire.

1. I feel my awarenesses have changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

2. I feel my knowledge has changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

3. I feel my skills have changed as a result of the Institute in the following ways:

4. I feel my attitudes/values have changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

5. I feel my behaviors have changed as a result of this Institute in the following ways:

6. The one thing I gained most from this Institute was:

7. One thing I had hoped to gain from this Institute but did not was:

8. One thing I gained from this Institute but did not anticipate initially was:

II. YOUR EVALUATION OF THE INSTITUTE

In this section you are asked to respond to questions concerning both (1) the major aspects of the Institute, and (2) the specific activities within the Institute.

A. Ratings of Major Aspects of the Institute

Listed below are several major aspects of the Institute. (Space is also provided for you to write in other aspects not listed). Please indicate your satisfaction regarding each listed aspect by circling the number corresponding to the label which best represents your satisfaction with a given aspect. Feel free to write comments in the space below each listing.

1 = very dissatisfied
2 = dissatisfied
3 = mostly dissatisfied
4 = mostly satisfied
5 = satisfied
6 = very satisfied

1.	Retreat (Tuesday)	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Institute (Wednesday to Saturday)	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	Scheduling of Activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Amount of Free Time and Breaks	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Amount of Required Homework (Readings, Planning)	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	Grading/Credit Arrangement	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	Administrative Details (Regis., Eval.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	Helpfulness of BORN FREE Staff: Structuring	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	Helpfulness of BORN FREE Staff: Feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	Sharing/Networking With Other Participants	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	Large Group Presentations	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = very dissatisfied
2 = dissatisfied
3 = mostly dissatisfied
4 = mostly satisfied
5 = satisfied
6 = very satisfied

12.	Videotape Viewing Sessions	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	Developmental Growth Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	Implementation Planning Groups	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	Writing Daily Logs	1	2	3	4	5	6
16.	Preparation of Implementation Plans	1	2	3	4	5	6
17.	Housing Arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	6
18.	Transportation Arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	Meals (lunch and dinner)	1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6
22.	Overall Institute, including Retreat	1	2	3	4	5	6

B. Ratings of Specific Activities Within the Institute

Below is a listing of the specific activities conducted within the Institute excluding the retreat activities. Please rate the usefulness of each activity by circling the number corresponding to the label which best represents how useful the activity was for you. Feel free to write comments in the space below each listing.

1 = not at all useful
2 = slightly useful
3 = moderately useful
4 = quite useful
5 = very useful
NA = not applicable

Wednesday

1.	Presentation: Systems Approaches to Program Development (Sunny)	1	2	3	4	5	6

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

1 = not at all useful
2 = slightly useful
3 = moderately useful
4 = quite useful
5 = very useful
NA = not applicable

2. Presentation: Resistant to Change (Warren)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
3. Videotape: Men's Choices and Changes	1	2	3	4	5	NA
4. Presentation: Racism/Sexism in Career Options (Vivian N.)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5. Rationale & Discussing of Literature Reviews (Level Groups)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6. Introduction to Implementation Plans (PIP's)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Thursday						
7. Career Family Tree (DGG's)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8. Videotape: Women Choices and Changes	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9. Videotape: Parenting—Three Generations	1	2	3	4	5	NA
10. Videotape: Parents as Influencers	1	2	3	4	5	NA
11. Resource Panel: Elementary	1	2	3	4	5	NA
12. Resource Panel: Secondary	1	2	3	4	5	NA
13. Resource Panel: Postsecondary	1	2	3	4	5	NA
14. Implementation Planning II (PIP's)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
15. Resource Sharing (Thursday Night)	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

1 = not at all useful
2 = slightly useful
3 = moderately useful
4 = quite useful
5 = very useful
NA = not applicable

Friday

16. Joe Househusband (DGG's)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
17. Implementation Planning III (Morning and Afternoon sessions)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
18. Brown Bag Discussion: Using Training Materials (Level Groups)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
19. Videotape: Why Change?	1	2	3	4	5	NA
20. Videotape: Schools as Influences	1	2	3	4	5	NA
21. Videotape: College as Influences	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Saturday

22. Sharing Implementation Plans (Level Groups)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
23. Presentation of Implementation Plans (Large Group)	1	2	3	4	5	NA
24. Physical Continuum	1	2	3	4	5	NA

C. Open-ended Statements

1. The three most satisfying aspects and/or activities of this Institute were:

   1.
   2.
   3.

2. The three least satisfying aspects and/or activities of the Institute were:

   1.
   2.
   3.

III. YOUR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, you are asked to respond to a few open-ended questions concerning (1) your conclusions about the Institute and (2) your recommendations for improving the Institute.

A. Your Conclusions about the Institute

1. Did the Institute meet your personal expectations? How so?

2. Hypothetically speaking, if you had it to do over again on deciding to come to the Institute, would you have changed your decision, knowing what you now know about what the Institute would be like? If yes, please explain why.

3. Do you plan to use the various training materials (printed modules, literature reviews, videotape) you received in follow up workshops with persons in your institution or state? If no, why not?

4. Would you like to field test additional videotapes? Which ones?

B. Your Recommendations for the Institute

1. What changes in content would you recommend (additions, deletions)?

2. What changes in sequencing or structuring the contents would you recommend?

3. What other changes (length of Institute, participant selection, facilities, staffing, etc.) would you recommend?

Appendix D -3

Project BORN FREE
Retreat Evaluation Form

code _____
cons _____
office use only

Name: _____ State: _____

Institution: _____

Position: ___Teacher ___Counselor ___Administrator Other _____

Level ___Elementary ___Secondary ___Higher Education/Post-secondary

Sex: ___Female ___Male Parent: ___Yes ___No

Please circle only one number per question unless otherwise indicated.

1. The retreat site was appealing, attractive, and well located. I felt comfortable in these surroundings.

   quite poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 superior

2. The retreat was well organized (i.e. agenda, activities, presentations, time, breaks, etc.).

   very poorly organized 1 2 3 4 5 6 extremely well organized

3. The goals of the retreat were very clear.

   not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 extremely clear

4. In my opinion, the overall goals of the retreat were accomplished.

   no goals accomplished 1 2 3 4 5 6 all goals fully accomplished

5. In general, I felt that the retreat climate was open, trusting and that information flowed freely among the participants.

   almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 almost always

6. I felt that when I had a contribution to make, I had an opportunity to make it.

   almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 almost always

7. I felt that the content and activities were interesting.

   almost never 1 2 3 4 5 6 almost always

8. The presenters were knowledgeable and competent.

   not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 superior

9. Please rate the following:

	very poor					extremely well done
Career Mixer	1	2	3	4	5	6
BORN FREE Institute overview	1	2	3	4	5	6
Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development	1	2	3	4	5	6
Career Development Framework	1	2	3	4	5	6
Career Life Line	1	2	3	4	5	6
Videotape: "World of Options"	1	2	3	4	5	6
Resource Networking of Problems and Solutions	1	2	3	4	5	6
Magic Seminar	1	2	3	4	5	6
Masculine/Feminine	1	2	3	4	5	6

(turn to back side)

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

10. Please rank the following in terms of its overall importance to accomplishing the goals of this retreat. (1=highest, 8=lowest)

_____ Career Mixer
_____ BORN FREE Institute overview
_____ Facilitators and Inhibitors of Career Development
_____ Career Development Framework
_____ Career Life Line
_____ Videotape: "World of Options"
_____ Resource Networking of Problems and Solutions
_____ Magic Seminar
_____ Masculine/Feminine

11. The retreat met my expectations.

no expectations met 1 2 3 4 5 6 all expectations met

12. This retreat will probably have a significant impact on my attitudes or behaviors.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 strongly agree

13. For me, the most important aspect of the retreat was:

14. The one thing about this retreat that troubled me and was the least satisfying was:

15. Other comments.

Project BORN FREE
University of Minnesota

Project BORN FREE

Build Options Reassess Norms Free Roles through Educational Equity

BORN FREE Products and Publications

October, 1978

Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology
Department of Psychoeducational Studies
College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Funded under a grant by the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Grant #565AH70023

I. PRINT TRAINING MATERIALS

These three training packets, combined with videotapes, form the core of the BORN FREE training materials. Each packet consists of 1) an introductory section with self-contained guidelines for users, 2) a set of experiential and cognitive learning strategies designed to help educators and parents change their attitudes and behaviors to expand career options for both women and men, 3) reprints of numerous articles and handouts used in the strategies, 4) a specially compiled Fact Pack with statistics on the status of women and men in the labor force, 5) an extensive set of references.

Hansen, L.S., Pelcak, D., Perreault, G., & Dege, D. BORN FREE Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Career Development: Elementary Level, October, 1978.

Hansen, L.S., Hatfield, T., Johnson, D., Teeson, T., Harper, J., & Perreault, G. BORN FREE Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Career Development: Secondary Level, October, 1978.

Hansen, L.S., Perreault, G., Lofgren, B., Follett, C., Watt, M.A., & Boe, A. BORN FREE Training Packet to Reduce Sex-Role Stereotyping in Career Development: Postsecondary/Higher Education Level, October, 1978.

II. VIDEOTAPE TRAINING MATERIALS

BORN FREE has produced nine half-hour color videotapes and viewers' guides which are an integral part of the training materials. The tapes are built around developmental themes of career socialization drawn from the literature reviews. They were also based on problems identified in systems analyses completed by pilot institutions. The tapes were developed by L. Sunny Hansen, Director, and Phyllis Kragseth, Media Specialist, with technical production by University Media Resources, Arnold Walker, Executive Producer. Dolores Dege coordinated development of the viewers' guides. The tapes consist of interviews and vignettes largely of students, parents, and staff in the BORN FREE pilot institutions. "BORN FREE: A World of Options" received the Best Videotape Award in the American Personnel and Guidance Association Film Festival in Washington, D.C., March, 1978. It is hoped that the tapes eventually will be shown on broadcast television but that they will be used primarily in programs and workshops for educators and parents to promote sex equity in career options.

Videotape No. 1 - BORN FREE: A World of Options
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen

Videotape No. 2 - Men: Choices and Changes
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Tim Hatfield, Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen

Videotape No. 3 - Women: Choices and Changes
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Gerri Perreault, Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen

Videotape No. 4 - The Joy of Choosing
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Sue Warsett, L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa

Videotape No. 5 - Parenting - Three Generations
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Phyllis Kragseth, L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa

Videotape No. 6 - Parents as Influencers
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Phyllis Kragseth, Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen

Videotape No. 7 - Schools as Influencers
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Doug Pelcak, L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa

Videotape No. 8 - Colleges as Influencers
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Barbara Lofgren, Beverly Mills-Novoa, and L. Sunny Hansen

Videotape No. 9 - Why Change?
Viewers' Guide: Dolores Dege, Gerri Perreault, L. Sunny Hansen, and Beverly Mills-Novoa

The videotape viewers' guides, designed for workshop leaders, consist of a general introductory section on the purpose of the Project, the tapes, and guides, and a discussion of how the materials can be integrated into training workshops. Brief information is provided on career development, sex-role socialization, and change process, as well as on the development, rationale, and format of the tapes. A section on guidelines for showing the tapes reviews aspects of group process and provides discussion hints for conducting workshops on this topic. The last part of each guide presents an overview of the purpose of each tape, a summary of initial field test results, and a set of questions relating to each tape segment. (Approximately 20 pages each.)

III. SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING MATERIALS

The reviews of literature are designed to provide documentation of the need for attention to reducing sex bias in career development of all persons. They attempt to answer the questions, "What do we know about 'career socialization' at different levels of development, and what can we do through home, school, and college to reduce the barriers and expand the facilitators of career options for women and men?"

A. Reviews of Literature

Pelcak, D. et al. Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Elementary Level. Technical Report No. 1, August, 1977. (64 pages)

Johnson, D., Harper, J., Hatfield, T., Teeson, T , and Hansen, L.S. Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Secondary Level. Technical Report No. 2, August, 1977. (100 pages)

Follett, C., Watt, M., Hansen, L.S., et al. Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Postsecondary/Higher Education Level. Technical Report No. 3, August, 1977. (113 pages)

B. Evaluation Reports

BORN FREE completed extensive evaluation of both its products and process. The product evaluation reports provide data on the validation of the training packets and the videotapes. They also report on the effectiveness of the BORN FREE training designs carried out in one state workshop and one national institute. Some data are also provided on workshops developed in pilot institutions.

The process reports provide exploratory evaluation of the process by which BORN FREE was carried out in the 14 pilot schools and colleges over a two-year period. The change process is analyzed according to the Rand Model of Educational Change, examining what happened as field site staff, in consultation with University staff, made plans for initiation, implementation, and continuation of BORN FREE efforts in their institutions. The reports can be extremely useful to those attempting to bring about educational change in the area of sex equity in career options.

Warsett, S. Evaluation Report on Field Testing of Color Video Cassette and Training Packets. Technical Report No. 4, August, 1977. (65 pages)

Warsett, S. Evaluation Report on BORN FREE Videotapes, Training Packets and Selected Workshops. Technical Report No. 9, October, 1978, (approximately 100 pages)

Keierleber, D. Evaluation of the 1977 BORN FREE Summer Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping. Technical Report No. 5, August, 1977. (79 pages)

Penn, P. Evaluation of the 1978 BORN FREE National Institute: A Workshop Model to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping. Technical Report No. 10, October, 1978. (168 pages)

Keierleber, D. & Hansen, L.S. Evaluation of Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, 1976-77. Technical Report No. 6, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., May, 1978. (117 pages)

Krusemark, F. Evaluation of the Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, 1977-78. Technical Report No. 8, October, 1978. (approximately 100 pages)

Keierleber, D. Case Summaries of the Educational Change Process in Project BORN FREE Institutions, 1976-77. Technical Report No. 7, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., May, 1978. (109 pages)

IV. PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTS

Project Progress Reports describe the internal development of Project BORN FREE over the two-year period. They describe each component of the Project, provide brief statements of developments in Project institutions, present evaluation highlights, include sample instruments and newsletters, discuss the process by which Project goals were carried out, and give a candid appraisal of problems and progress in carrying out a project of this scope.

Hansen, L.S. & Jones, L. Project BORN FREE First Quarterly Report, Women's Educational Equity Act, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., December, 1976. (25 pages)

Hansen, L.S. Project BORN FREE Second Quarterly Report, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., March, 1977. (31 pages)

Hansen, L.S. Project BORN FREE Third Quarterly Report, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., June, 1977. (26 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Annual Report, September 9, 1976-August 31, 1977. WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., October, 1977. (37 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE First Quarterly Report, September 1, 1977-December 31, 1977, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls. (39 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Second Quarterly Report, January 1, 1978-March 31, 1978, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls. (49 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Third Quarterly Report, April 1-June 30, 1978, WEEA, USOE, College of Education, U of M, Mpls. (48 pages)

Hansen, L.S. & Mills-Novoa, B. Project BORN FREE Final Report, September 1976-1978, WEEA, USOE, DHEW, College of Education, U of M, Mpls., September, 1978. (approximately 65 pages)

V. INFORMATION SHARING

A. Publications

Hansen, L.S. & Keierleber, D. BORN FREE: A Collaborative Consultation Model for Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping. Personnel and Guidance Journal, March, 1978, 395-399.

B. Papers Presented at National Conferences*

Johnson, D. "BORN FREE: Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping in Educational Institutions - Literature Review and Systems Analysis." APA, San Francisco, CA., August 29, 1977.

Keierleber, D. "BORN FREE: Reducing Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping in Educational Institutions - Process and Product Evaluation." APA, San Francisco, CA., August 29, 1977.

Hansen, L.S. "BORN FREE: Reducing Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping - Staff Development and Change Process." Paper presented at American Psychological Association National Convention, San Francisco, CA., August 29, 1977.

Hansen, L.S. "An Applied Developmental Intervention to Reduce Career-Related Sex-Role Stereotyping in Elementary, Secondary, and Higher Education Settings." Paper presented as part of a symposium on "Educational Intervention to Promote Female Development--A Life Span View." American Psychological Association National Convention, San Francisco, CA., August 27, 1977.

Hansen, L.S. "BORN FREE: Change Process Evaluation of a Psychoeducational Intervention to Reduce Career Sex-Role Stereotyping for Women and Men." Paper presented as part of a Symposium on "Cross-Cultural Sex Differences" at the American Educational Research Association Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada, March 30, 1978.

* Numerous other workshops were held and speeches presented for local, state, and national conferences, organizations, and institutions.

C. Project Information

The following brochures, summaries, and newsletters have been created to provide descriptive information about the Project and the materials for those interested in issues of sex equity for both women and men.

Mills-Novoa, B. & Hansen, L.S. Project Abstract, March, 1978.

Mills-Novoa, B. & Staff. BORN FREE News. Bi-monthly newsletter to promote communication among BORN FREE institutions. The initial 14 schools and institutions of higher education participating in the project are Lincoln Elementary, Sunrise Junior High, and Mariner High School in White Bear Lake, MN.; Webster Elementary, Mounds Park Junior High, and Washington High School in St. Paul, MN.; Harley Hopkins Elementary, North Junior High, and Eisenhower High School in Hopkins, MN.; Lakewood Community College in White Bear Lake, MN.; Normandale Community College in Bloomington, MN.; Special Intermediate School District #916 in White Bear Lake, MN.; College of Liberal Arts Career Planning Office (University of Minnesota) in Minneapolis, MN.; and Augsburg College, Minneapolis, MN. The newsletter has been expanded to include the 107 participants in the 1978 National Institute as well as others around the nation concerned about sex bias in career options.

Hansen, L.S. BORN FREE Products and Publications. A listing and brief description of all the modules and reports produced by Project BORN FREE in the first two years of its existence.

Boe, D. Project Logo. The yellow and orange project logo, an original design, has been distributed as a public relations tool to arouse interest in BORN FREE and create awareness of the problems the Project addresses.

Dege, D. Videotape Abstracts. One-page description of each of the nine BORN FREE videotapes.

Kragseth, P. Videotape Overview. A brief description of the developmental themes and content of each of the nine BORN FREE videotapes.

VI. DISSEMINATION

Materials will be reviewed for dissemination by the Education Development Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160, (617)-969-7100 or 1-800-225-3088. EDC is the official WEEA project dissemination contractor.

Because of USOE dissemination restrictions, the length of our packets and reports, and budget limitations, we are unable to engage in general dissemination. However, selected information papers and reports are available (while supply lasts) for cost of reproduction and mailing.

For copies of abstract, information papers, or sample of training materials or to be put on newsletter mailing list for BORN FREE Network, contact:

L. Sunny Hansen, Professor and Director
Project BORN FREE
139 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Drive SE
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN. 55455
(612) 373-0202 or 373-5558

For dissemination information, contact:

Dissemination Center for Women's Educational Equity Act Programs
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02160
(617) 969-7100 or 1-800-225-3088

LSH/bj
October, 1978

APPENDIX F

COMPONENTS OF PROJECT BORN FREE EVALUATION IN SECOND YEAR

I. Product Evaluation

A. Goals/Purposes:

1. Obtain information for revising training packets and videotapes.

2. Obtain normative information on training packets and videotape.

B. Procedures/Instruments

1. Individual critiques of training packets by selected readers.

2. Field test training packets and videotapes at collaborating institutions.

3. Field test training packets and videotapes at institutions other than collaborating institutions.

4. Completing of "External Field Test Report" by persons field testing project materials outside collaborating institutions.

5. Completion of "Learning Strategy Rating Form" by learning strategy participants.

6. Completion of "Videotape Evaluation Form" by viewers.

II. Change Process Evaluation

A. Goals/Purposes:

1. Monitor the implementation progress at each of 14 local collaborating educational institutions.

2. Record significant or major BORN FREE implementation activities that have occurred at each collaborating institution.

3. Measure the impacts or changes resulting from BORN FREE implementation activities.

4. Identify and describe change process variables operating at collaborating institutions which appear to facilitate or hinder implementation progress.

5. Draw conclusions and make recommendations concerning (1) the process of attempting innovative change in educational institutions, and (2) the evaluation of "change agent" efforts.

B. Procedures/Instruments

1. Site visits by project director, consultants and change process evaluator.

2. Completion of "Monthly Site Reports" by project consultants to the 14 collaborating sites.

3. Completion of "Bimonthly Project Status Reports" by project director.

4. Completion of "Quarterly Progress Report" by field site team leaders.

5. Completion of "Major BORN FREE Activity Report" by field site teams.

6. Bimonthly site interviews by all project evaluators.

7. Completing "Evaluation of Project Status" Questionnaire by project staff at second quarter all-project meeting.

8. Completion of "Workshop Evaluation Form" by workshop/ activity participants.

9. Completion of "Project Impact Questionnaire" by faculty/staff at collaborating institutions.

10. Completion of "Report on Administration of Project Impact Questionnaire" by field site team leaders.

III. National BORN FREE Training Institute Evaluation

A. Goals/Purposes:

1. Conduct participant analysis for structuring institute goals and activities.

2. Continuous monitoring of institute to identify strengths and weaknesses for immediate and future revisions on institute.

3. Determine immediate impacts (expected and unexpected) of institute on participants.

B. Procedures/Instruments

1. Review participants' application materials (e.g., statements of expectations, various status variables).

2. Completion of "Pre-Assessment Survey" by institute participants.

3. Completion of "Daily Progress Reports" by developmental growth group leaders (staff).

4. Participant observations by project evaluators.

5. Completion of "Retreat Evaluation Form" by institute participants.

6. Completion of "Post-Assessment Survey" by institute participants.

Appendix G

Project Abstract